NATIONAL LIBRARY
OTTAWA

CANADA

BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE
OTTAWA

4956

NAME OF AUTHOR... KENNETH MOWAT MILNE

TITLE OF THESIS... NEED STRUCTURE, PROFESSIONAL ORIENTATION AND MOBILITY

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED... PH.D.

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED... 1969

Permission is hereby granted to THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(Signed)... K M Milne

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

c/o Mrs J. DAY
166 Victoria Ave
Dalkeith
Western Australia

DATED... 12th Sept ... 1969

NL-91 (10-68)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

NEED STRUCTURE, PROFESSIONAL ORIENTATION AND MOBILITY

by

K. M. MILNE

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1969

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Need Structure, Professional Orientation and Mobility" submitted by Kenneth Mowat Milne in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy

Supervisor

External Examiner

Date September 11, 1969

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine whether different levels of professional orientation, mobility orientation and actual mobility were associated with varying strengths of certain selected psychological needs of elementary teachers. A sample of one hundred and seventy-six teachers from fourteen urban schools was obtained in the Regina Public School District.

The Corwin Professional Role Orientation Scale, the Seeman Mobility Achievement Scale, an actual mobility questionnaire and the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule were selected as suitable instruments with which to collect the necessary information. The teachers also completed a questionnaire giving personal data.

All the data were transferred to IBM punch cards and analyzed with the help of the computer. The Mann-Whitney U Test and the Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance by Ranks Test were the major statistical tests employed. In all, ten hypotheses were tested.

The first three hypotheses stated that there would be a significant difference between the scores on the need Autonomy, need Nurturance, and need Affiliation dimensions of the EPPS for elementary teachers in the highest and lowest categories of professional orientation. The data did not support any of these hypotheses.

The second three hypotheses predicted that there would be a significant difference between the scores on the need Achievement, need Endurance, and need Order dimensions of the EPPS for elementary teachers in the highest and lowest categories of mobility orientation. The hypotheses were not supported by the data.

The final four hypotheses made the prediction that there would be a significant difference between the scores on the need Change, need Autonomy, need Deference, and need Nurturance dimensions of the EPPS for elementary teachers in the highest and lowest third categories of actual mobility. Again, there was no support of the hypotheses by the data. Only in the case of Hypothesis 3.2 which was concerned with need Autonomy, was there a significant difference. However, the difference was not in the predicted direction.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express his sincere thanks and appreciation to the following persons for their assistance during the planning and completion of the investigation.

To the members of the thesis committee:

Dr. C. L. Bumbarger, thesis supervisor.

Drs. F. C. Thiemann, D. Friesen and D. L. Schaeffer.

Dr. R. Jones, external examiner.

To the teachers and principals of the Regina Public School District who helped in providing the necessary data.

To Superintendent J. Burnett for his personal assistance, and to the Regina Public School District Board of Education who gave permission for the collection of the data.

To my wife, Annelie, who helped and encouraged me for so many years and made the completion of the study possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	THE PROBLEM . . . . . Introduction, 1; Statement of the Problem, 3; Significance of the Problem,3; Definition of Terms, 6; Summary of Chapter I, 7.	1
II.	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE : EDWARDS' PPS NEEDS . . . . . Edwards' PPS Needs, 8; Need Achievement, 8; Need Order, 9; Need Affiliation, 10; Need Nurturance, 11; Need Change, 12; Need Endurance, 13; Need Deference, 15; Need Autonomy, 14; Summary of Chapter II, 15.	8
III.	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE : PROFESSIONAL AND MOBILITY ORIENTATION. . . . . Professional Orientation, 16; Mobility Orientation and Promotional Aspiration, 19; Mobility Orientation, 20; Actual Mobility, 23; Summary of Chapter III, 25.	16
IV.	CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK. . . . . Introduction, 26; The Concept of Needs, 26; Needs and Professional Orientation, 29; Needs and Mobility Orientation, 31; Summary of Conceptual Framework, 33; Sub-problems and Hypotheses, 34; Sub-problem 1, 35; Sub-problem 2, 35; Sub-problem 3, 36; Summary of Chapter IV, 36.	26
V.	INSTRUMENTATION AND METHODOLOGY . . . . . Introduction, 38; Instrumentation, 38; The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS), 38; The Professional Role Orientation Scale (PROS), 41; The Mobility Achievement Scale (MAS), 43; Actual Mobility, 46; Statistical Techniques Used, 48; Collection of the Data, 49; Description of the Sample, 49; Delimitations, 53; Limitations, 54; Summary of Chapter V, 54.	38

CHAPTER		PAGE
VI.	TEST OF THE HYPOTHESES AND FINDINGS . . . . . Introduction, 55; Analysis of Sub-problem 1, 55; Sub-problem 1, 56; Testing Hypotheses 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3, 56; Analysis of Sub-problem 2, 58; Sub-problem 2, 58; Testing Hypotheses 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3, 58; Analysis of Sub-problem 3, 60; Sub-problem 3, 60; Testing Hypotheses 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4, 60; Summary of Chapter VI, 62.	55
VII.	SUPPLEMENTARY ANALYSES AND FINDINGS . . . . . Supplementary Analyses--Hypotheses 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3, 63; Supplementary Analyses--Hypotheses 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3, 67; Supplementary Analyses--Hypotheses 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4, 72; Discussion of Findings, 74; Summary of Chapter VII, 75.	63
VIII.	CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . Summary of the Study, 76; Introduction and Purpose, 76; The Data, 76; Findings, 77; Introduction, 77; Hypotheses 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3, 77; Hypotheses 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3, 77; Hypotheses 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4, 78; Conclusions and Implications, 78; Recommendations, 80.	76
BIBLIOGRAPHY	. . . . .	81
APPENDIX	. . . . .	88

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Cross Tabulation of Number of Full-Time Positions Held by Years of Teaching Experience.	48
II.	Frequency Distribution of Elementary Teachers in Sample in Categories of School, Sex and Marital Status.	50
III.	Frequency Distribution of Elementary Teachers in Sample in Categories of Sex, Age and Marital Status.	51
IV.	Frequency Distribution of Elementary Teachers in Sample in Categories of Years of Formal Training Credited for Salary Purposes, Teaching Experience and Number of Full-Time Positions Held.	52
V.	Frequency Distribution of Teachers in Categories of Full-Time Positions Held	53
VI.	Frequency Distribution of Teachers Holding Five or More Full-Time Positions.	53
VII.	Number, Range, Mean and Standard Deviation of PROS Scores for Total PROS Sample and High-Low PROS Groups.	57
VIII.	Necessary Critical Value and Z Scores for Needs Autonomy, Nurturance and Affiliation for High-Low PROS Groups.	57
IX.	Number, Range, Mean and Standard Deviation of MAS Scores for Total MAS Sample and High-Low MAS Groups	59
X.	Necessary Critical Value and Z Scores for Needs Achievement, Endurance and Order for High-Low MAS Groups	59
XI.	Z Scores and U Statistics for Test 1 and Test 2 for High-Low Actual Mobility Groups.	62

TABLE		PAGE
XII.	Rank Order of Eight Needs in Terms of Relative Strength for High-Low PROS Groups.	64
XIII.	Means and Standard Deviations for Study Sample and Four Other Groups for Needs Autonomy, Nurturance and Affiliation. . . .	66
XIV.	Results of Analyses of Needs Achievement, Endurance and Order for Vertical and Geographical Mobility Orientation	69
XV.	Rank Order of Eight Needs in Terms of Relative Strength for High-Low MAS Groups.	71
XVI.	Means and Standard Deviations for Study Sample and Four Other Groups for Needs Achievement, Endurance and Order.	71
XVII.	Results of Supplementary Analyses of Needs Change, Autonomy, Deference and Nurturance. .	73
XVIII.	Means and Standard Deviations for Study Sample and Four Other Groups for Needs Change, Autonomy, Deference and Nurturance. .	73
XIX.	Means, Standard Deviations and t-Scores for Total Teacher and Edwards' General Adult Samples	74

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

I. INTRODUCTION

Campbell (1968) considers that in order to produce desirable effects upon children, elementary teachers should possess qualities such as scholarly orientation, divergent thinking, tolerance, warmth and originality, yet he found evidence to indicate that they are discouraged from exhibiting warmth, and do not have a scholarly orientation. In addition, he argues that ". . . the combination of personality needs and occupational press [predisposes] teachers towards authoritarianism, orderliness, deference and convergent thinking." (p. 6).

The findings of Dunkin (1968) suggest that among the teachers of his sample, conformity rather than originality was encouraged, and in order to gain need satisfaction, teachers had to learn to lower their achievement drive and develop a higher need for affiliation (pp. 49-50). It may well be that in the teaching profession there are potent pressures being exerted upon school personnel to act in group-approved ways that are not always in the best interests of the children.

In addition to the evidence presented by Campbell and Dunkin cited above, Jackson and Guba (1957) state that, in their opinion:

> . . . existing evidence indicates that teachers in general, are not motivated by a strong interest in social service, by powerful nurturant needs, or even by a deep interest in children. (p. 180).

These writers also add that the mass media frequently portray teachers ". . . as sexually impotent, obsequious, eternally patient, painstakingly demanding, and socially inept. . . ." (p. 190). Is this a grotesque caricature or is it a true picture based on observation and experience? Does it imply that teachers as a group express low sexual needs yet are high on deference and endurance? Are these traits typical of all teachers, or are they only characteristic of elementary teachers? If they are characteristic of elementary teachers in general, as is indicated in the three studies mentioned above, are there some groups of whom they are not typical? For example, do elementary teachers with a high level of professionalism share these traits?

At present it is not known what relationships exist between the level of professionalism held by elementary teachers and such factors as interpersonal interaction, job satisfaction, effectiveness, and career ambitions. Nor is it known what relationships exist between teachers' needs and their level of professional orientation. It may be that with different levels of professional orientation, teachers have different psychological needs and drives and consequently express them in quite disparate ways. A knowledge of some of these relationships would be of interest to students of educational administration and would perhaps be useful in the management of educational organizations.

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The general problem to which this study was addressed is:

How are the psychological needs of elementary teachers as measured by the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule related to levels of professional orientation, to levels of mobility orientation, and to actual mobility?

III. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

It has been pointed out that:

> We cannot long study the behavior of living organisms without observing that they need things; and it is their wants and needs which have to be investigated if the reasons for their behavior are to be discovered. (Boring, Langfeld and Weld, 1948, p. 112).

In fact, Krech, Crutchfield and Ballachey (1962), in discussing the importance of the study of needs, maintain that needs ". . . are the initiating and sustaining forces of behavior." (p. 62). Or as Haire (1964) writes, ". . . everyone is constantly striving for need satisfactions." (p. 22).

Although considerable research in the social sciences has been directed toward finding out what people do under varying administrative conditions, a lesser amount has been aimed specifically at discovering why they act as they do, or what are the basic motivating influences. Any information which could shed some light on this area would be valuable for both theory and practice of educational administration.

Awareness of the needs and drives of elementary teachers may, in fact, be essential to sound leadership, for as Campbell

and Gregg (1957) assert:

> Administration is responsible for achieving the goals of the organization and for satisfying the needs of its members. Needs of members include a reasonable sense of security, a feeling of belongingness and an opportunity to participate in organizational processes. The members also need to have their contributions and achievement recognized by others, particularly by their leaders. (p. 309).

Among teachers there may be some who aspire to higher administrative positions and who may have certain need structures, personality attributes and cognitive orientations which manifest themselves in drives toward achievement, dominance, and aggression, or conversely, they may be submissive and deferent to those in authority. If this is so, then a knowledge of the need structures may enable administrators to place these individuals with their individual needs in situations where they can be of maximum effectiveness through having their own needs gratified in the course of their--the teachers'--employment.

Other individuals, frustrated because they are not able to find need satisfaction on the job, may indulge in excessive movement--mobility and turnover--which tends to be detrimental to organizational effectiveness. Bruce (1964) for example, holds that in the opinion of members of boards of education, teacher movement is one of the most confusing and troublesome of their problems. Having cognizance of personal needs and occupational pressures affecting teachers may enable administrators to take remedial action, and through gratification of the most predominant needs, reduce the movement to more reasonable proportions. Butler (1961) gives evidence to indicate that there is a

direct positive relationship between job satisfaction and the retention of beginning teachers.

Jackson and Guba (1957) contend that when a study concerns public school teachers two points of importance should be considered:

> First, teachers, perhaps more than any other professional group, are in a position to serve as models for individuals whose preferences are as yet ill-defined. . . .
>
> Second, in addition to this model-serving function, teachers are relatively free to sanction positively or negatively (either implicitly or explicitly) those preferences which children do exhibit. (p. 176).

They go on to ask what are the need structures of teachers who act as models, and what are the preferences which they are likely to approve or disapprove? (pp. 176-7). We may find that some of these people have strong drives which cause them to distort or restrict the teaching-learning situation. Some researchers, such as Friedenberg (1963), suggest that staff-shared attitudes and inclinations may be significant in the definition of compliant student roles which are detrimental to healthy personality growth and genuine learning. Henry (1968) for instance, describes observing a teacher who instructed the children in obedience, docility and agreement with her own ideas without being aware of it. He noted also that this was not just an isolated case. Administrators should know of such tendencies if and when they exist and use their knowledge to try to improve the situation. As Crow (1967) has pointed out, "Any effort that will bring the motives to the level of awareness is worthy of careful consideration by those who are responsible for the education of an individual." (p. 67).

If persons with greater needs for mobility and visibility are

those with lower professional orientation, as Griffiths (1965) has suggested, then this has significant implications for those who formulate and direct promotional policies. If the highest positions tend to be staffed by people who are less professionally oriented than their subordinates, there may be a hidden cost to education. C. A. Weber (1954) proposes that such a cost exists, and also that highly professional people continuously encourage the best types of young men and women to enter the profession; they have caught the service aspect of it and so they actively seek out those among the young who would be a credit to the "cause" (p. 238). The importance of this is realized by Otto (1955) who stated:

> What these people bring with them to their new jobs and what they can become after their initial appointments will determine in large measure what direction education will take. (p. 28).

Thus, there is reason to believe that a greater understanding of the personality variables manifested as needs and drives would be of assistance in the supervision of school personnel.

IV. DEFINITION OF TERMS

Although a number of terms are used in the discussion of the conceptual framework of this study and in the review of the related literature, only two terms are defined here for the convenience of the reader. They are:

> Need. A need is a construct (a convenient fiction or hypothetical concept) which stands for a force (the physio-chemical nature of which is unknown) in the brain region, a force which organizes perception, apperception, intellection, conation and action in such a way as to transform in a certain

direction an existing, unsatisfying situation. (Murray, 1938, pp. 123-4).

Press. . . . kind of effect an object or situation is exerting or could exert upon the S. It is a temporal gestalt of stimuli which usually appears in the guise of a threat of harm or promise of benefit to the organism. (Murray, 1938, p. 148).

V. SUMMARY OF CHAPTER I

Chapter I provided an overview and statement of the problem, pointing out that different conceptions of the psychological needs of elementary teachers are held by different people. Doubt was expressed as to how consistent or valid these beliefs are. This indicated that there could be some value in undertaking a study of some of the dimensions of the needs of elementary teachers, in particular an examination of the relationships which exist among their psychological needs and their professional and mobility orientations.

The evidence so gained might be helpful in improving interpersonal relations and perhaps even be useful in the identification, recruitment, selection and placement of new members of the teaching profession. With the selection of the best recruits, and the encouragement of professionalism among all teachers, a gradual improvement in the educational situation in our schools seems possible.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE: EDWARDS' PPS NEEDS

I. EDWARDS' PPS NEEDS

Edwards (1965) selected fifteen needs from the twenty-eight identified by Murray (1938).* The section which follows contains a discussion of eight of them--those used in the generation of the research hypotheses for this study--along with a description of each and an account of the relevant research. The order of presentation is that of Edwards as given in the EPPS Manual.

1. Need Achievement
2. Need Order
3. Need Affiliation
4. Need Nurturance
5. Need Change
6. Need Endurance
7. Need Deference
8. Need Autonomy

Need Achievement

The desire for achievement, according to Murray, is the desire or tendency to do things as rapidly and/or as well as possible (p. 164). The evidence indicates that this drive tends to be a male attribute somewhat dependent on age and education, and one that is not overly characteristic of elementary teachers (Grossack, 1957; Klett, 1957; Strother and Schaie, 1955). The ability of subjects appears to have some influence on scores for the drive, too. Gebhart and Hoyt (1958)

---

*All further references to Murray are from Explorations in Personality. New York: Science Editions, 1938.

and Krug (1959) both found that in first year college students it was the over-achievers rather than the under-achievers who scored higher.

Dunkin (1968) suggested that teachers are not typified by high achievement motivation and showed that ". . . teaching is more likely to be attractive to those who have low achievement needs." (p. 49). He also noted that each of the three "experience" groups showed no significant difference on need Achievement. A Jackson and Guba (1957) study supported this view and reported that when the rank order of a number of needs of teachers of considerable experience was compared with the rank order of the same needs of teachers with little experience, the order changed but need Achievement was ranked last in both cases. However, contradictory evidence was given by Morris (1963) who determined that female science teachers exhibited a higher achievement need than a general college sample.

In summary of the above evidence, need Achievement is a male characteristic dependent on education and experience and teachers--especially elementary--do not manifest above-average needs.

Need Order

Murray is of the opinion that "The need Order describes behavioral trends that are directed towards the organization of a subject's immediate environment. . . ." (p. 200). Some members of the public consider that this is a typical picture of the average teacher who takes great pains to ensure tidiness and system in her work and who attempts to instill the trait in her children. The findings of Guba,

Jackson and Bidwell (1959) show that order is one of the most characteristic needs of teachers. In another study, Jackson and Guba (1957) discovered that of the fifteen needs investigated, need Order consistently appeared high in the teachers' need hierarchies. The research evidence of Dipboye and Anderson (1961), also, lends support to the contention that teachers are characterized by strong need Order drives. For instance, they write that although the stereotypes of teachers had very flat profiles for most needs, need Order was seen as "peaking" quite highly in comparison. Andrews (1957) noted that, in his study of professional educators, commerce teachers had significantly higher scores than some other groups. In short, the evidence available strongly supports the view that need Order is a trait or propensity descriptive of teachers at all levels.

Need Affiliation

According to Murray (p. 173), man finds satisfaction in being with others. He needs contact with friends and has learned that he can fulfil a psychological need by being a member of a group.

Evidence of age differences in the relative strengths of this need was supplied by Spangler and Thomas (1962) and by Koponen (1957) who showed that elderly people tended to manifest higher need Affiliation drives than younger people.

Sheldon, Coale and Copple (1959) used need Affiliation as one of the variables in their study of potentially good teachers and found that those who were categorized as "good" scored above the average on the need. In Dunkin's (1968) investigation it was noted that those

with higher job satisfaction scores had significantly higher scores on Affiliation. When teachers were compared with accountants and mechanical engineers, Gray (1962) found that they--the teachers--exhibited a significantly higher response. Scandrette (1962) noted that on need Affiliation elementary teachers were higher than the norms supplied by Edwards, and he explained that in his opinion, the reasons for the difference between some education students and teachers--especially those with more experience--were due to differences in age, experience, and selective attrition. Thus, there appears to be reason to believe that not only are teachers characterized by higher needs for Affiliation than some other groups, but also that there may be some occupational press exerting an influence toward a strengthening of the need among teachers. Another explanation might be that selection and selective attrition had taken place.

Need Nurturance

As noted by Murray, need Nurturance is the tendency to want to assist others who need support or assistance. The need is part of the positive aspect of the relationship, the giving of the aid (p. 181). Evidence is available to indicate that, in comparison with other male professional groups, male teachers seem to exhibit a higher need to give nurturance (Gray, 1962). Dunkin (1968) has even suggested that both male and female teachers may learn to increase their drive to give nurturance through the influence of their employment. He asserts that, "There appeared to be a systematic variation on the need from lower scores for the 'novice' and 'intermediate' groups to higher scores for

the 'veteran' group." (p. 49).

Be this as it may, the bulk of the evidence reveals that this is a typical female trait. Klett (1957), Strother and Schaie (1955), Spangler and Thomas (1962), Edwards (1965), and Dipboye and Anderson (1962), all found that there were significant sex differences on the need in favor of females.

Need Change

Murray does not have a need Change per se but rather considers the drive to be based on a "ratio of Sameness to Change." (p. 203). The research evidence on this need reflects the lack of definition and does not seem to lend itself to a consistent analysis. For example, Murray states that "Sameness seems to increase with age" (p. 204); this was supported by the study of Morris (1963). However, Klett (1957) and Thorpe (1958) found conflicting evidence. Sex appears to play only a limited part in the determination of scores on this drive. The norms of Edwards (1965) reveal that females in both samples scored significantly higher than the males while both Andrews (1957) and Jackson and Guba (1957) showed that the females in their samples scored lower than the mixed groups from two colleges.

Although the studies cited above indicate significant differences between the various groups under consideration, a number of other studies in which need Change was a variable leaves the impression that the need is not one which discriminates well. For instance, studies by Izard (1960), Koponen (1957), Spangler and Thomas (1962), Scandrette (1962) and Appley and Moeller (1963) show few significant differences. Since

the evidence is conflicting, the importance of need Change in the study justified the use of the sub-scale.

Need Endurance

Murray selected this variable to stand for persistence of effort (p. 147) and it appears that people interested in hard facts and organized data exhibit a strong need tendency. Dipboye and Anderson (1961) found that the need was quite typical of the stereotype of scientist, physician and engineer, as seen by their subjects. McDonald and Gynther (1963) and Suziedelis and Steimal (1963) discovered that high aptitude students scored highly and that biological and physical science students showed the same trend. Some teachers--especially high school--also showed a strong need (Thorpe, 1958; Tobin, 1956; Getzels and Jackson, 1963). Further supportive evidence of this contention was supplied by Pool (1963) who noted that persons who made realistic choices of future occupation also scored high on need Endurance. A considerable amount of evidence seems to suggest that need Endurance is a drive characteristic of elementary teachers. In fact, it appears to be characteristic of teachers at all levels (Getzels and Jackson, 1963; Jackson and Guba, 1957; Guba, Jackson and Bidwell, 1959).

Need Deference

Need Deference as described by Murray, is acquiescence, submission and yielding to power (p. 82), and conformity to group standards has been studied experimentally. Sherif and Sherif (1952) and Asch (1952) both found that there was a tendency for subjects to

form a common evaluation; a tendency to defer to what they considered to be the superior knowledge of the group. Coch and French (1948) and Roethlisberger and Dickson (1941) noted similar results of compliance with group norms in industrial settings.

Dunkin (1968) noted that teachers seem to increase their Deference scores over time. Morris (1963) came to a similar conclusion and considered that the need for Deference increased in science teachers with age and/or experience. These general findings were typical of other studies, too, (Jackson and Guba, 1957; Guba, Jackson and Bidwell, 1959).

Need Autonomy

The characteristics of need Autonomy as given by Murray, appear to have a close affinity with freedom. Another such equation of the need for autonomy with independence was made by Savage (1968) who said that the drive is fulfilled when the individual is given responsibility and opportunity to make decisions which "rightfully" belong to him.

Grisvold (1958) conducted a validity study of the Autonomy and Deference sub-scales of the EPPS and found that in a series of Asch-type experiments:

> The correlation between the conformity scores and the scores on the Autonomy sub-scale was found to be -.54, . . . Therefore, the Autonomy sub-scale of the EPPS as described by Edwards is empirically valid with respect to the criterion of conformity behavior as developed in this study. (p. 447).

This finding is useful in the interpretation and meaning of a number of separate and perhaps otherwise unrelated data. High Autonomy scores not only seem to relate negatively to conformity behavior but also

positively to resistance to change of attitude under the influence of an investigator. McDonald and Gynther (1963) found that medical students--who tend to be traditional--did not score high. This finding was further corroborated by Izard (1960) whose study revealed that there was a positive relationship between need Autonomy and a resistance to change of attitude under pressure.

In the case of teachers, studies carried out by Jackson and Guba (1957), Dunkin (1968) and Guba, Jackson and Bidwell (1959) all noted that teachers are characterized by low scores on need Autonomy. If the results of these studies are valid, perhaps the implication might be drawn that teachers are not very resistant in their attitudes under pressure from the environment.

II. SUMMARY OF CHAPTER II

Chapter II was designed to provide a review of the literature related to the eight EPPS needs which were selected for testing the hypotheses of the study. Each of the needs was briefly described, some general studies were discussed and some other research evidence pertaining more particularly to teachers was cited.

CHAPTER III

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE: PROFESSIONAL AND MOBILITY ORIENTATION

I. PROFESSIONAL ORIENTATION

> The world of man is made up of geography and atmosphere, personal psychology and social cross-currents, changing elements and stable landmarks. His behavior is always a result of his internal drives, his maturing capacities, and both the stimuli and constraints of his environment . . . behavior, therefore is a product of multiple forces. Any effort to understand and modify it must contend with those forces.

So says Levinson (1968, p. 1) in his book, The Exceptional Executive, and thus points out the complexity of everyday supervision of personnel. If principals and superintendents are to interact capably with their school staffs in a professional manner they must be aware of these environmental press and psychological needs.

Data obtained from well over one thousand teachers suggested that basic failings in human relations by administrators, rather than salary, were the factors most productive of occupational frustration. The evidence showed that teachers wanted a genuine stake in matters affecting their professional activities (Reinhardt and Lawson, 1959). In another study, Bruce (1964) found that not only did teachers give inadequate community financial support of the school as a reason for dissatisfaction, but they also gave the failure of the school patrons to respect and accept them as professional people. The teachers considered themselves as professionals and wanted the community to share their attitude.

The importance of professional autonomy to some teachers is illustrated by the generalizations formulated by Chase (1951). One was that teachers find satisfaction by planning their own work, a second was that teachers want to have an opportunity to participate actively and regularly in educational decision-making, while a third was that there is a close relationship between teachers' feelings with regard to the quality of professional supervision and the system as a whole. Evidence gathered by Butler (1961) led him to make the following statement which lends a measure of support to the above generalizations.

> The most significant cause of job satisfaction or lack of same are the feelings toward the administration of the school, the feelings of freedom in the classroom or lack of it, and whether or not there was involvement in school policy making. (p. 123).

It appears that many teachers who regard themselves as professionals will accept leadership from their principals but they also desire some freedom in other areas.

A professional teacher has been defined as follows:

> . . . one whose practice is based on skill acquired after study of an esoteric body of knowledge. He is committed to teaching as an essential and altruistic vocation. He is concerned with providing impartial, indispensable and unique service to students. A professional teacher is active in his professional organization. He has a strong sense of identification with other teachers and is loyal to his profession. He views himself as being in a position of trust with respect to students. The responsibility involved in this position of trust leads him to demand autonomy with respect to decisions which are related to the educational welfare of students. (Hrynyk, 1966, p. 262).

There is strong reason to believe that all teachers do not measure up to the ideal expressed in the definition quoted from Hrynyk,

and that professionalism should be regarded as a continuum ranging from non-professional--not exhibiting any of these characteristics--to highly professional, the ideal. Most teachers probably fall well inside the extremes of the continuum.

Another way of looking at professionalism is by regarding it as being a number of continua each with a different dimension (Robinson, 1966). Some teachers may be less "client-oriented" while others may be less "ethics-oriented" or less "organization-oriented". Still others may consider themselves as "fully-fledged" professionals and demand a high degree of autonomy.

Professional role orientation, which is one of the major dimensions of this study, may be regarded as the individual's cognitive determinant of professional behavior. The concept implies that school personnel have certain mental attitudes with respect to the ideology of professionalism as it relates to teaching. This self-influence has two main aspects; one, it influences the person's expectations for his own behavior as a member of a school staff, and two, it has some effect upon his tendencies to action.

Participatory decision-making and the sharing of responsibility is a means by which professional attitudes may be improved, yet the procedure tends to bind each of the participants to concerted action within the regulatory framework of the collective decision and thus poses problems.

However, Tannenbaum (1962) suggests that organizational control need not create undue hardship for those who are professionally

oriented. He believes that a relatively high level of control may be a reflection of increased participation and mutual influence throughout the system, with a correspondingly greater integration of all personnel. His study further indicates that increased control exercised by all levels of the organizational hierarchy is associated with increased effectiveness (p. 236).

At this point, another investigation might be cited in which it was found that all organizational members did not appear to have the same need for autonomy and independence. In a study of female employees, clerks were given more freedom to make decisions regarding their own work, and yet, although the majority expressed greater satisfaction with the new arrangement, there was a sizable group which ". . . preferred to be submissive, depend upon others, obey rules, and follow directions." (Tannenbaum, 1962, p. 241).

If organizational and administrative procedures can be modified to suit the needs of individuals and groups, as has been suggested by Fiedler (1967), then it may be possible to match an independent-minded group with a permissive leader and vice versa. The creation of a coincidence of individual and group needs with the means for their gratification may be a major task of the successful educational administrator.

II. MOBILITY ORIENTATION AND PROMOTIONAL ASPIRATION

Mobility orientation can be considered from two viewpoints; promotional aspiration and actual mobility. It is the first of these

that is the concern of this section.

Mobility Orientation

Several leading writers on organizational theory have postulated categorizations of personality types by describing them in terms of the mobility orientation which they exhibit in their workaday world. Presthus (1962) for instance, proposes three modal patterns of accommodation to organizational demands, one of which--upward-mobility--has relevance here. The upward-mobile is the individual who aspires to, seeks, and is often successful in gaining, occupational advancement. He finds pleasure in organizational life and works in ways that tend to bring the benefits of higher salary and loftier status. Presthus proposes that advancement in a larger organization demands a kind of personality type with a strong mobility-orientation attuned to the organization as a whole and to the people holding superior positions in it (pp. 176-9). The upward-mobile exhibits a considerable preference for directive leadership toward his subordinates.

Because of the upward-mobile's orientation toward the task and goal achievement, his strongly internalized needs give him a drive which manifests itself in striving for the success of those objectives which he considers are important--those of the organization--rather than those of the group. He has a tendency to become impersonal in his relationships with his subordinates, often eschewing affiliation unless it is essential to his plans. The upward-mobile's orientation is, therefore, more inclined toward the "procedural", which is

regarded as decisive in career success, than toward the "substantive" (Presthus, 1962, p. 190).

Cohen (1958) presents evidence to suggest another connection between mobility orientation and organizational goal achievement. "High-power" individuals who had the ability to satisfy subordinates' needs received considerably more task-centred communications from low status, high mobility-oriented members. His explanation was that the highly oriented persons wanted to show the "high-power" people that they were performing competently and were therefore worthy of promotion.

Lipham (1960) reports a study in which he investigated the relationship between certain personality variables and effective behavior in the principal's role. He found that:

> . . . keen achievement and mobility drives are characteristic of the effective principal. He may be portrayed as holding specific goals for further study, stressing better job performance as a goal in life, and viewing the school superintendency as a desirable occupational objective. (p. 3).

In a study of the personality attributes of successful business leaders, Henry (1956) found that persons with a high level of mobility-orientation perceived their superiors as demanding a certain deference. In their relations with subordinates, however, they tended to be more dominant with less desire for affiliation (p. 408).

Seeman (1958) conducted an investigation in which he studied some of the relationships among administrative behavior, mobility-orientation, and actual mobility. He found a significant correlation

(-.37) between mobility-orientation and the Consideration dimension of leader behavior as measured by the LBDQ. Conversely, there was a positive correlation between mobility-orientation and the Initiating Structure dimension. The evidence provided by Seeman suggests that mobility-oriented superintendents have needs for dominance, order and achievement, whereas the nonmobility-oriented superintendents have needs for affiliation and nurturance.

Carlson (1962) investigated school superintendents in terms of their orientation toward mobility, and classified them as "career-bound" and "place-bound" (p. 8). He found that the career-bound persons were more willing to leave their present position in the interests of promotion and, when in a new position, exhibited a need for change of rules, in contrast to the place-bound individuals who preferred to tighten up the existing ones (pp. 28-9). The career-bound superintendents appeared to have needs for achievement, autonomy, change and dominance, whereas the place-bound superintendents seemed to be characterized by needs for deference and affiliation.

In summary, there appear to be indications of a relationship between the need structure of the individual and his orientation toward promotional advancement. For example, the ambitious, promotionally oriented person seems to be associated with dominant drives for achievement, endurance and order.

Having dealt with the research evidence pertaining to mobility orientation--promotional aspiration--in the first half of the section, the purpose of this second half is to present some of the research

findings concerned with actual mobility.

Actual Mobility

The concept "mobility" generally has reference to actual movement and has two major aspects. The first aspect concerns the geographical movement of teachers--the movement out of the position they occupy to another elsewhere. This can be in the same school as in the case of a different grade level, another school in the same district, or a position in a different system.

A second feature of mobility is the movement of teachers to another position for the purpose of accepting promotion. This has been termed "vertical" mobility.

Teacher mobility and its impact upon organizational effectiveness is no new problem. Fisher (1963) has written that when there is a high percentage of mobility, a determinant appears to be unsatisfactory conditions (p. 374). For instance, a number of investigations such as those by Francoeur (1963) and Lundrigan (1966) have found a significant relationship between teacher mobility and teacher satisfaction. Greene (1964) supplied evidence to show that teacher dissatisfaction, mainly with the administration, the school and the community, resulted in excessive movement. He indicated that the teacher's solution was to become mobile.

In a study of the factors related to teacher retention in Connecticut, Hill (1958) found that forty per cent of the teachers thought that they should have fewer non-teaching duties; twenty-three per cent suggested reducing class size; while others wanted more salary,

more teaching materials and more specified assistance (p. 9). These reasons appear to be characteristic of a need for succorance rather than achievement, and tie in with the evidence given in Chapter II that teachers are not very achievement motivated.

Thomas (1964) made the assertion that over sixty-six per cent of the dissatisfactions leading to teacher mobility in a county in Ohio was avoidable. He claimed that higher salaries, more opportunities for promotion, and specialization in a major field of study or in a preferred grade level, were the main reasons for teachers leaving their positions.

In an area with over twenty per cent teacher turnover annually, Conville and Anderson (1956) found that in addition to the usual factors associated with mobility, teachers gave unhappy interpersonal relations, poor supervision, school board interference, and inability to get along with supervisors, as reasons for wanting to leave. A Canadian study by Hohn (1964) reported a similar finding. Indications were that here there was a deprivation of the teachers' needs for affiliation, succorance and autonomy.

The research evidence cited in the section above seems to suggest than an overall reason for teacher mobility may lie in the lack of adequate opportunities for the individuals to satisfy their needs and drives. With modified administrative procedures and a greater awareness of the problem by those in the higher positions, there is a possibility that an improvement could be made.

III. SUMMARY OF CHAPTER III

The contents of Chapter III outlined a review of the relevant literature concerned with professional orientation and mobility orientation. Actual mobility was also briefly considered.

Section I discussed some of the implications arising out of the different degrees of professionalism held by teachers. Not all teachers qualify as professional in terms of the definition given in the text. This was shown to have consequences for the problem of autonomy and control, for example, some people have higher needs for autonomy than others.

Section II was concerned with mobility orientation--the desire for professional advancement. The discussion indicated that teachers, as well as others, were quite different in their drives to better their status and prospects. They have varying patterns of accommodation to the environmental press; some are eager to succeed and others less enthusiastic.

Section II also dealt with actual mobility. When teachers consider that the conditions are not very satisfactory, they appear to seek positions elsewhere. Some of the factors considered to be important in "causing" teachers to leave their positions were cited. These ranged from personal and interpersonal factors to others such as salary and working conditions. It was further pointed out that the needs and drives of teachers did not seem to be always adequately catered to.

CHAPTER IV

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

I. INTRODUCTION

A theorist who posits a dualistic energic system of basic needs is H. A. Murray. Like Abraham Maslow and others, he offers a list of needs but stresses that a more extensive one is required if justice is to be done to the rich variety of human behavior. He attempted to identify the "directional forces" in the lives of young people. Along with a team of fellow psychologists at the Harvard Psychological Clinic, he conducted a series of experimental investigations aimed at discovering, through the study of actual behavior, what basic drives are to be found in human beings (Woodward, 1958, p. 108).

Murray distinguished two main classes of drives and drew up a list of twenty-eight manifest needs (Woodward, 1958, pp. 108-9). The list was later utilized by Edwards (1965) to construct his Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS), which was used in this study to define and measure the strengths and incidence of eight needs of elementary school teachers.

II. THE CONCEPT OF NEEDS

There is an approach to the study of personality which stresses motivational factors within the individual, both as determinants of action and as important phenomena in their own right. Psychologists

using this approach assert that the major influence upon behavior is not only the stimulus situation per se but also the individual's perception, apprehension and apperception of it. In short, both the actual situation and the manner in which the subject perceives events and his estimation of them, are of importance in how he actually behaves.

In Explorations in Personality, Murray undertook the task of formulating a series of proposals outlining a theory of personality which would make possible the study of these factors and attempted to develop a dynamic scheme for the description and analysis of the phenomena. Personality was conceived of as being a hypothetical structure that affects the experience and modes of behavior of the individual.

> Between what we can directly observe--the stimulus and the resulting action--a need is an invisible link, which may be imagined to have the properties that an understanding of the observed phenomena demand. (p. 60).

Murray used the term "need" to mean the internal motivational tendencies that can be objectified as an innate force in the brain region and which organizes perception, apperception and conation. It influences certain cognitive processes in the direction of need satisfaction or harm-avoidance. There is a driving, directing dimension which decisively influences future actions. As Murray states:

> . . . it should be clear that the term 'need' or 'drive' does not denote an observable fact--the direction of the activity, for example,. . . . It refers to a hypothetical process within the brain. . . . (p. 72)

Murray focussed his attention on the analysis of needs and

arrived at an extensive classification.* Basically, he recognized needs as primary or viscerogenic, and secondary or psychogenic. Viscerogenic needs pertain to those which are engendered and stilled by periodic vital physiological events, for example, thirst, hunger, sex. The psychogenic drives have no subjectively localizable bodily origins and include such needs as affiliation, order, deference, nurturance, achievement, endurance, change and autonomy, to name only a few. In all, thirteen viscerogenic and twenty-eight psychogenic needs were listed and analysed.

Murray's explanation of the nature of needs did not stop with a mere list and a dichotomous classification. He considered that needs are dynamically organized within each person and elaborately interconnected and interrelated in various ways. The interrelation of needs often results in a relatively enduring pattern. Some needs can become predominant and habitual in an individual or perhaps become more easily stimulated by changes in the external objects which are perceived in a different light. There can exist a hierarchy of needs with certain drive tendencies being more determinant, influential, or immediate than others. For example, a person may grow to enjoy the exercise of authority in his occupational position and through frequent gratification develop a well-established dominance-aggression-autonomy pattern of needs. Another, in a similar situation,

---

*Other schemata elaborated in later years are beyond the scope of this study.

but with a subordinate role, may develop a deference-abasement orientation which through time may result in either frustration or resignation.

Needs and drives can become attached consistently to objects and thus give rise to regular habits of action. Consistencies of connection such as these lead to relatively stable organizations in the brain. Traces (images) of valuable objects in familiar settings become integrated in the mind with the drives and emotions that are customarily excited. They sometimes enter consciousness as fantasies or plans of action that can be realized in behavior patterns. A person who holds definite ideas, attitudes or opinions may, through certain mental processes, be led to engage in certain professional practices. The highly professional teacher may attend meetings of his professional organization or may read extensively in the professional literature. A hypothetical organization of this sort may be termed a "need integrate" or "complex" (Murray, p. 111).

III. NEEDS AND PROFESSIONAL ORIENTATION

With the concept of "needs" now in mind, it is pertinent to examine some of the relationships which exist among them and the professional orientation of teachers.

The professional teacher, according to the relevant literature, engages in activities such as providing "impartial, indispensable and unique service to students." For some reason he feels himself impelled to act in this way (need Nurturance) even though the

immediate, or long term, rewards do not give an adequate explanation. He conducts himself in a certain way, often in opposition to influential and "unpleasant" press simply because he thinks he has to; he appears to have a need or drive which forces him. He often regards it as a matter of principle, in which he cannot submit to the press.

For example, a teacher with a high level of professional orientation may want to help his class in certain ways (need Nurturance), which he considers is proper and essential to their well-being (need Order), yet his superiors may oppose him (superiors' need Dominance), and take strong, repressive measures (superiors' need Aggression) to compel him to "toe the line". In turn, the teacher may feel impelled to resist (need Autonomy); he may have an over-riding drive to keep giving the aid to those in his care (need Endurance). History is replete with examples of martyrs who sacrificed even their lives for what they considered was "right".

On the other hand, there appear to be many individuals who readily capitulate (need Abasement-need Deference) to press which they perceive as harmful or at least posing a potential threat of harm. Instead of having a desire to help their pupils in spite of the threat, they may be in greater need of assistance themselves (need Succorance). They may be quite content to play a subservient role (need Deference), in order to get the satisfactions or gratifications of their needs as easily and safely as possible. Not all persons

immediate, or long term, rewards do not give an adequate explanation. He conducts himself in a certain way, often in opposition to influential and "unpleasant" press simply because he thinks he has to; he appears to have a need or drive which forces him. He often regards it as a matter of principle, in which he cannot submit to the press.

For example, a teacher with a high level of professional orientation may want to help his class in certain ways (need Nurturance), which he considers is proper and essential to their well-being (need Order), yet his superiors may oppose him (superiors' need Dominance), and take strong, repressive measures (superiors' need Aggression) to compel him to "toe the line". In turn, the teacher may feel impelled to resist (need Autonomy); he may have an over-riding drive to keep giving the aid to those in his care (need Endurance). History is replete with examples of martyrs who sacrificed even their lives for what they considered was "right".

On the other hand, there appear to be many individuals who readily capitulate (need Abasement-need Deference) to press which they perceive as harmful or at least posing a potential threat of harm. Instead of having a desire to help their pupils in spite of the threat, they may be in greater need of assistance themselves (need Succorance). They may be quite content to play a subservient role (need Deference), in order to get the satisfactions or gratifications of their needs as easily and safely as possible. Not all persons

want to be dominant, autonomous or aggressive.

The literature on professionalism also suggests that professionally oriented persons have a need or desire to interact socially (need Affiliation). They readily form associations to further their ideals and values and, in fact, seem to be characterized by the propensity to achieve a strong and well-planned organization to defend and further their interests. From this it may perhaps be construed that their mental attitudes lead them to engage in certain well-defined activities, as Murray suggests, with needs acting as intermediary processes. They create press to represent their basic interests of professionalism.

IV. NEEDS AND MOBILITY ORIENTATION

In order to obtain some of the rewards in education it is usually necessary to move from one position to another. For instance, a teacher aspiring to promotion usually has to move to obtain the position of principal or superintendent, or he may even have to become mobile in order to gain a higher or more prestigious rank as a teacher. He may have to move to another school or district. Not only does the change result in additional salary or status, but it may bring added responsibilities and anxieties. Some teachers may be willing to give up their present ties of family, home or district (mobility orientation) while others may not be so eager to make the sacrifice. They may not consider that the rewards are enough compensation for the worry and extra work.

want to be dominant, autonomous or aggressive.

The literature on professionalism also suggests that professionally oriented persons have a need or desire to interact socially (need Affiliation). They readily form associations to further their ideals and values and, in fact, seem to be characterized by the propensity to achieve a strong and well-planned organization to defend and further their interests. From this it may perhaps be construed that their mental attitudes lead them to engage in certain well-defined activities, as Murray suggests, with needs acting as intermediary processes. They create press to represent their basic interests of professionalism.

IV. NEEDS AND MOBILITY ORIENTATION

In order to obtain some of the rewards in education it is usually necessary to move from one position to another. For instance, a teacher aspiring to promotion usually has to move to obtain the position of principal or superintendent, or he may even have to become mobile in order to gain a higher or more prestigious rank as a teacher. He may have to move to another school or district. Not only does the change result in additional salary or status, but it may bring added responsibilities and anxieties. Some teachers may be willing to give up their present ties of family, home or district (mobility orientation) while others may not be so eager to make the sacrifice. They may not consider that the rewards are enough compensation for the worry and extra work.

Griffiths (1965) reports that in his study he found a group of teachers who were not so much interested in teaching as in gaining promotion. They actively sought advancement, voluntarily accepted extra duties and continually tried to impress their superiors. They were the group who eventually achieved success and "who got to run the system."

Another group of teachers in Griffiths' study, amounting to about fifteen per cent, were "benefits-oriented"; some were horizontally mobile toward the "best deal" possible under their circumstances while the rest were those who had once had strong aspirations for promotion but who had since lowered them.

Merton (1957) made an analysis of the reward system in organizations and studied what he termed the "carry-over effect". He maintained that the effect of the reward extended beyond the gratification of the individual's immediate needs and tended to influence his cognitive orientation to the organization as a whole. In short, he said that those people who are most interested in gaining occupational advancement reflected this in their behavior and attitudes, or as Presthus (1962) expressed it, they became "organization men".

Persons interested in promotion appear to regulate their actions toward their aims and consequently, have strong needs to achieve (need Achievement), to be recognized by superiors, and to be friendly with them (need Affiliation). Their orientation toward the organization suggests that they have a strong need Order. Henry (1956) summarized the results of several studies of successful

Griffiths (1965) reports that in his study he found a group of teachers who were not so much interested in teaching as in gaining promotion. They actively sought advancement, voluntarily accepted extra duties and continually tried to impress their superiors. They were the group who eventually achieved success and "who got to run the system."

Another group of teachers in Griffiths' study, amounting to about fifteen per cent, were "benefits-oriented"; some were horizontally mobile toward the "best deal" possible under their circumstances while the rest were those who had once had strong aspirations for promotion but who had since lowered them.

Merton (1957) made an analysis of the reward system in organizations and studied what he termed the "carry-over effect". He maintained that the effect of the reward extended beyond the gratification of the individual's immediate needs and tended to influence his cognitive orientation to the organization as a whole. In short, he said that those people who are most interested in gaining occupational advancement reflected this in their behavior and attitudes, or as Presthus (1962) expressed it, they became "organization men".

Persons interested in promotion appear to regulate their actions toward their aims and consequently, have strong needs to achieve (need Achievement), to be recognized by superiors, and to be friendly with them (need Affiliation). Their orientation toward the organization suggests that they have a strong need Order. Henry (1956) summarized the results of several studies of successful

businessmen--men with strong mobility orientation--and found that they perceived authority in terms of a controlling and helpful relationship with their superiors (need Order), but displayed a considerable desire for control over their subordinates (need Dominance). Their subordinates were seen as "doers of work" rather than as people.

From the evidence presented pertaining to aspiration for promotion and mobility orientation, it can be seen that there are relationships existing among the manifest needs of school personnel, their mobility orientation, and their organizational attitudes.

V. SUMMARY OF THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The conceptual framework adopted in the study was based on the assumption that each person has a number of basic needs or drives which have an influence on his everyday behavior. The individual is also subjected to the forces of press--the influence of situational factors--and especially the psychological environment, which he tends to interpret in his own idiosyncratic way. Combinations of needs and the perceived effects of press form need integrates or complexes of which a cognitive orientation toward professionalism is one. A professional teacher appears likely to have strong needs for Autonomy, Nurturance, and Affiliation.

Another cognitive orientation held by teachers is perhaps promotional aspiration--mobility orientation. The individual may see promotion open to him and promising rewards. He may have needs for

Achievement, Endurance, and Order which point his actions toward securing advancement.

Closely associated with mobility orientation is the amount of actual mobility engaged in. Some teachers seem to have a need which drives them to seek new positions (need Change). Whether the need is for change or a need for autonomy, is not known at present.

Some teachers express little desire to change positions. They appear to be quite satisfied to stay where they are, doing a competent job and supplying service to their pupils. They also seem to have the happy ability to keep on good interpersonal terms with their colleagues. These teachers seem to exhibit low needs for Change and higher needs for Deference.

From this brief conceptual framework, and from the two surveys of the literature on needs, professionalism, and mobility, a number of research hypotheses were formulated.

VI. SUB-PROBLEMS AND HYPOTHESES

To facilitate analysis, the major problem concerning the relationship between need structure and levels of professional orientation, mobility orientation and actual mobility was broken down into three researchable sub-problems.

These sub-problems each contained a number of hypotheses. Sub-problems 1 and 2 contain three hypotheses, and Sub-problem 3, four hypotheses. In each hypothesis, the highest and lowest thirds were stipulated as the groups to be tested. This has relevance to

the adopted procedure, i.e., the scores of all the subjects on the instrument under consideration were placed in rank order then divided into three approximately equal groups. The groups were then nominated as the highest, intermediate and lowest categories.

Sub-problem 1

Do elementary teachers with high professional orientation scores have significantly higher scores on certain selected needs than elementary teachers with low professional orientation scores?

Hypothesis 1.1. A significant difference exists between the need Autonomy scores of elementary teachers in the highest and lowest categories of professional orientation; those in the highest category will score significantly higher on need Autonomy.

Hypothesis 1.2. A significant difference exists between the need Nurturance scores of elementary teachers in the highest and lowest categories of professional orientation; those in the highest category will score significantly higher on need Nurturance.

Hypothesis 1.3. A significant difference exists between the need Affiliation scores of elementary teachers in the highest and lowest categories of professional orientation; those in the highest category will score significantly higher on need Affiliation.

Sub-problem 2

Do elementary teachers with high mobility orientation scores have significantly higher scores on certain selected needs than elementary teachers with low mobility orientation scores?

Hypothesis 2.1. A significant difference exists between the need Achievement scores of elementary teachers in the highest and lowest categories of mobility orientation; those in the highest category will score significantly higher on need Achievement.

Hypothesis 2.2. A significant difference exists between the need Endurance scores of elementary teachers in the highest and lowest categories of mobility orientation; those in the highest category will score significantly higher on need Endurance.

Hypothesis 2.3. A significant difference exists between the need Order scores of elementary teachers in the highest and lowest categories of mobility orientation; those in the highest category will score significantly higher on need Order.

Sub-problem 3

Do elementary teachers with high actual mobility scores have significantly higher scores on certain selected needs than elementary teachers with low actual mobility scores?

Hypothesis 3.1. A significant difference exists between the need Change scores of elementary teachers in the highest and lowest categories of actual mobility; those in the highest category will score significantly higher on need Change.

Hypothesis 3.2. A significant difference exists between the need Autonomy scores of elementary teachers in the highest and lowest categories of actual mobility; those in the highest category will score significantly higher on need Autonomy.

Hypothesis 3.3. A significant difference exists between the need Deference scores of elementary teachers in the highest and lowest categories of actual mobility; those in the lowest category will score significantly higher on need Deference.

Hypothesis 3.4. A significant difference exists between the need Nurturance scores of elementary teachers in the highest and lowest categories of actual mobility; those in the lowest category will score significantly higher on need Nurturance.

VII. SUMMARY OF CHAPTER IV

Chapter IV outlined the concept of "needs" as formulated by H. A. Murray. It was suggested that psychological needs are forces that organize the individual's mental processes in such a way that he is impelled to act in order to relieve the tension, or to satisfy his dominant needs.

Further, needs were shown to be in a consistent relationship to professional and mobility orientation. In this way, a conceptual

framework was developed suggesting that here was a fruitful area of investigation.

A later section supplied three sub-problems with a total of ten hypotheses formulated from them. The sub-problems were concerned with professional orientation, mobility orientation and actual mobility, respectively.

CHAPTER V

INSTRUMENTATION AND METHODOLOGY

I. INTRODUCTION

The investigation was based on the contention that differences in needs are associated with different levels of professional orientation, mobility orientation, and actual mobility, and that these relationships could be tested statistically. Thus, the aim of Chapter V is to outline in some detail the instruments which were used to measure the variables with which the study was concerned. The instruments used were:

1. The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS)
2. The Corwin Professional Role Orientation Scale (PROS)
3. The Seeman Mobility Achievement Scale (MAS)
4. Data pertaining to actual mobility.

The chapter also contains a description of the methods of data collection and organization. At the end of the chapter is a description of the sample itself, along with a statement of the delimitations and limitations of the study.

II. INSTRUMENTATION

The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS)

The EPPS was designed by A. L. Edwards (1965) as a means of assessing the relative strengths of fifteen normal personality needs. The statements used in the test and the variables which the statements

purport to measure originated in the work of H. A. Murray and his associates at the Harvard Psychological Clinic. The needs investigated in this study were:

1. Achievement
2. Deference
3. Order
4. Autonomy
5. Affiliation
6. Nurturance
7. Change
8. Endurance

Construction of the EPPS. A paired-comparison method was employed in the construction of the EPPS and each of the fifteen needs is indicated by nine items. The items for each need are paired with items for every other need which has a similar social desirability rating. Each pair of needs is coupled twice in this way and the result is two hundred and ten items (Stricker, 1965, p. 200). This particular design is used in an endeavour to control social desirability as a source of variance and is usually regarded as one of the particular merits of the schedule (Radcliffe, 1965, p. 195).

Shaffer (1959) reports that as a consequence of the matching, only two of the need scores have correlations with social desirability which are significantly above zero and even these two are low, being in the nature of .32. Thus, the EPPS sidesteps a commonly experienced pitfall of many questionnaires, ego involvement (p. 119). However, a caution should be made to the effect that social desirability may vary from group to group and so cannot be entirely discounted (Bjerstedt, 1959, p. 117). The EPPS is an ipsative scale and this fact may have some influence on the scores in terms of the relative

strengths of the needs. For example, choice of one alternative necessarily results in lower scores for the other item or dimension.

The fifteen needs of the EPPS can be evaluated in terms of both T-score and percentile norms for men and women college students. The norms are based on 749 men and 760 women tested in 29 liberal arts colleges widely distributed throughout the United States. Supplementary percentile norms are supplied in the Manual for a "general adult sample" which included 5,031 men and 4,932 women.

Reliability. Test-retest correlation coefficients reported by Mann (1958) based on a three-week interval ranged from .55 to .87 with a median of .73. Horst and Wright (1959) obtained a median of .80, and the manual (Edwards, 1965), gives a median correlation coefficient of .78 for the needs scores. Shaffer (1959) comments that: "Because the need scales are short, the modest reliabilities are not unexpected: internal consistencies range from .60 to .87 and retest correlations are low." (p. 119).

Validity. Providing evidence of the validity of an instrument is regarded by test constructors as a particularly difficult operation. In one investigation, respondents were asked to rate themselves on each of the EPPS needs. The self-ratings ranged from a perfect correlation to some that were less so (Edwards, 1965). Another study was conducted where the subjects were asked to do "Q sorts" of themselves in relation to the statements from the EPPS items. Some results showed a high level of correlation but others showed considerably less agreement between their self-ratings and the scores (Edwards, 1965).

Korman and Caltharpe (1962) compared the means of a number of need scores and corresponding self-ratings. Their finding was a correlation coefficient of .56.

Various other researchers have attempted validation studies. For instance, Dunnette, Kirchner, and De Gidio (1959) investigated concurrent validity by means of a comparison of the EPPS and an "interest area" on the Strong Vocational Interest Blank. Little meaningful relationship was found. Correlations in the expected direction were found by Edwards (1965) with the EPPS and the two tests, the Taylor MAS and the Guilford-Martin Personality Inventory.

Three other studies aimed at the investigation of the validity of the schedule were undertaken. Bendig (1958) and Morton (1959) found a correlation of Achievement with course results. Correlation coefficients of approximately .40 were noted. After an extensive review of the evidence relating to the validity of the EPPS sub-scales Bjerstedt (1959) considers that ". . . items chosen in most instances give the impression of adequate face validity. . . ." (p. 118). He further suggests that the internal consistency coefficients and low intercorrelations between most of the needs support this view (p. 118).

The Professional Role Orientation Scale (PROS)

As a means of determining the teachers' professional orientation--or their attitude toward teaching as a profession--the Professional Role Orientation scale which was constructed by R. G. Corwin (1963) at the

Ohio State University was used. The instrument is perhaps one of the best known for the purpose and has been used by other researchers at the University of Alberta (Robinson, 1966; Hrynyk, 1966; Scharf, 1967). MacKay and Miklos (1968) adapted it further for Canadian use and utilized it in a systems-analysis study. Because it is relatively short--comprising only sixteen items--and is easy to administer, it was deemed suitable for this study.

Construction of the PROS. The Corwin scale was developed to measure teachers' professional role orientation and intended for the investigation of role conflicts in schools. After an extensive review of the literature a large number of statements was selected and assembled on the basis of their appropriateness to several dimensions of professionalism. Each of the statements was judged to have face validity and after consideration for possible duplication and ambiguity, they were reduced in number, refined and modified.

Reliability. Following selection in terms of internal consistency, two groups of items were established and the correlations computed. The scale scores were thus subjected to a split-half test of reliability. Results showed that the scale yielded a figure of .65. Corwin considered this to be an acceptable scale reliability.

Validity. As a means of determining the validity of the PROS, Corwin (1963) compared it with an employee orientation scale and found that there was a rather low correlation coefficient of only .07.

A further attempt at validation was made when the PROS was administered to two groups of teachers who were categorized as "high"

or "low" on professionalism dependent on their rating by judges in terms of various criteria. The data obtained revealed that there were significant differences beyond the .01 level for the means of the total scores of the two groups (Corwin, 1963).

Additional supportive evidence was obtained in a study conducted at the Ohio State University Laboratory school. The teachers were regarded as highly professional on the basis of the same criteria mentioned above. The "School" group scored considerably higher than the original "high" validating group.

Robinson (1966) conducted a study of the relationship between school personnel's professional role orientation and the bureaucratic characteristics of schools and found that the scale discriminated quite highly between differences in professionalism.

In light of the information given, the PROS was considered to be sufficiently reliable and valid for its intended use.

The Mobility Achievement Scale (MAS)

As a means of defining the level of desirability of promotion held by teachers, the Seeman Mobility Achievement Scale was used. The MAS was designed to provide a measure of promotional aspiration held by the respondents. The purpose of the scale as described by Seeman (1964) is to provide ". . . a measure of the relative reward the individual places on occupational mobility." (p. 219).

Construction of the MAS. From a study carried out by Reissman (1953) Seeman (1958) adapted the methodology and used it in the development of a scale so that a choice among specific alternatives

is presented and the person must decide which values, if any, he would be willing to sacrifice for advancement in his occupation (p. 634).

In the initial stages of the development, Seeman interviewed a considerable number of practising administrators who were encouraged to suggest items indicative of mobility orientation. Refinement, modification, and rejection of unsuitable items resulted in a sixty item scale which was then tried out. Experience with the new scale and further analysis of results led to the final fourteen item instrument.

Reliability. Seeman (1958) reported that a split-half reliability of .64 was obtained in an investigation of forty-four superintendents while another study of 100 principals yielded a comparable figure of .75. In a study by Seeman and Silberstein (1959) of the relationship between mobility and prejudice, again a figure for reliability of .75 was obtained.

Validity. A study by Seeman and Silberstein (1959) was undertaken as part of the process of securing adequate validation evidence. The study demonstrated that the effects of mobility on prejudice depend on the concept of mobility held by the individual. Robin (1957) obtained data to indicate that the performance of insurance executives can be predicted, and that the performance correlates with mobility orientation.

Seeman presents evidence from yet another study to demonstrate the degree of validity. Data from a study by Halpin (1956) were used

with mobility data and it was found that upward and downward mobility in itself had no relationship with leadership style as measured by the LBDQ, but taking mobility orientation into account did uncover significant results.

Defining Mobility Orientation. The MAS was used to obtain measures of the teachers' mobility orientation. The measurement attempted was the individual's perception of the desirability of promotion or the perceived attractiveness of occupational advancement. This orientation can be further differentiated in terms of being either vertical or geographical in nature.

Vertical mobility has reference to positional change in the school's hierarchical structure and involves considerations of autonomy, authority, aspirations for salary and status improvement, prestige, power and responsibility. Geographical mobility on the other hand, is more concerned with actual movement in and around the system, involving as it does sacrifices through travel, time expended, severance of personal and perhaps even family ties.

As both of these dimensions of occupational advancement involve sacrifices and personal adjustment to new situations, the individual's level of promotional aspiration may be regarded as a composite of the two interdependent sets of attitudes. The MAS can be conveniently divided into two seven item sub-scales, one purporting to measure vertical orientation and the other geographical orientation.

Although no hypotheses were formulated to test these sub-areas, since both of the sub-scales have relevance to the analysis of

mobility orientation they were treated in the supplementary analyses to determine if they were significant in terms of the eight need scores of the EPPS.

Actual Mobility

The research area dealt with in Sub-problem 3 is concerned with differences in the psychological needs of elementary teachers who vary in the amount of actual mobility in which they engage. People differ to a considerable extent in their desire for a change of occupation, duties, or even just the scene. Some move from job to job while others remain in the same position year after year, finding satisfaction where they are.

However, the measurement of actual mobility poses certain difficulties. It does not seem sufficient to consider only the number of positions held--the number of changes made--because obviously not all members of the teaching profession have had equal opportunity to move. Many persons have only been teaching for one year and so their moves have been strictly limited. Others have taught for up to forty years and so a straight comparison would not be sound. Further, actual mobility seems to be more easily accomplished in recent times because of expanding systems, more opportunities, and so on.

Because of these and other difficulties, a mobility scale had to be constructed which would enable the teachers to be ranked in some way, allowing the researcher to group them into thirds and thus categorize them as high, intermediate, and low on actual mobility.

The ratio of the number of years of teaching experience to the number of full-time positions held, was not sufficient because one year's experience, divided by one position held, constitutes a value of unity whereas twenty years' experience, divided by twenty positions held, also constitutes unity. The fact that two such teachers could not be considered as identical cases was obvious.

The actual mobility information consisted of two questions:

1. How many full-time positions have you held since you started teaching?

    1. 1 position
    2. 2 positions
    3. 3 positions
    4. 4 positions
    5. over 4 positions (please specify here how many).

2. Teaching experience

    1. 0 to 3 years
    2. 4 to 6 years
    3. 7 to 10 years
    4. 11 to 15 years
    5. over 15 years.

From the information supplied by the teachers in response to these two questions, the researcher was able to sort out sections of the sample in different ways and thus obtain groups having high, intermediate, and low actual mobility scores. For example, all the teachers with fifteen years of teaching experience were sorted out,

ranked in order of the number of full-time positions held, then divided into three approximately equal groups. The scores of these high, intermediate, and low groups were then suitable for analysis by the Mann-Whitney U Test and Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance by Ranks Test. This procedure was used for further analyses when it was slightly modified by selecting out groups on a different basis. A full description of each procedure is given in the chapter devoted to analysis of the results of the tests. A tabulation of experience and positions reported is provided in Table I.

TABLE I

CROSS TABULATION OF NUMBER OF FULL-TIME POSITIONS HELD BY YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Years of Experience	Number of Positions Held					Total
	1	2	3	4	Over 4	
0 - 3	38	15	2	-	-	55
4 - 6	12	6	13	5	1	37
7 - 10	8	1	5	2	1	17
11 - 15	3	1	3	4	1	12
Over 15	10	7	8	12	18	55
TOTAL	71	30	31	23	21	176

III. STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES USED

Each of the hypotheses was tested by means of Mann-Whitney U tests. A supplementary analysis was carried out using the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance by ranks test and the .05 level was used throughout.

IV. COLLECTION OF THE DATA

Each of the fourteen schools in the sample was visited and the questionnaires distributed by the principal. The principals called special staff meetings at which they informed the teachers of the purpose of the study, asked for their cooperation, and assisted with the directions for completion of the instruments. The questionnaires were picked up two days later.

The data for each teacher consisted of:

1. fifteen EPPS need scores,
2. one total PROS score,
3. one total MAS score,
4. one vertical mobility sub-score,
5. one geographical mobility sub-score, and
6. demographic and actual mobility information.

V. DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE

When the sample of 210 was optically scored, 34 had to be rejected because they did not measure up to the internal consistency criterion* suggested by Edward (1965, p. 15). This

---

*In the construction of the EPPS, there is provision for a check on the internal consistency of the subject's responses. "Scores on the consistency variable are based upon a comparison of the number of identical choices made in two sets of the same 15 items." (Edwards, 1965, p. 15). Thus, if the subject's consistency score is better than 10, there is evidence to suggest that he has not made his choices on the basis of chance alone. This .06 level was the one adopted as the cut-off point for acceptance.

meant that 176 were retained, making approximately 84 per cent of the original sample. Table II above shows the frequency distribution of the elementary teachers in the sample in categories of school, sex and marital status.

TABLE II

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF ELEMENTARY TEACHERS IN SAMPLE IN CATEGORIES OF SCHOOL, SEX, AND MARITAL STATUS

	Sex		Marital Status			
School	Male	Female	Single	Married	Other*	Total
1	4	18	5	16	1	22
2	4	17	6	14	1	21
3	3	16	6	10	3	19
4	3	13	7	8	1	16
5	1	11	8	4	-	12
6	3	9	6	5	1	12
7	2	9	10	1	-	11
8	1	10	6	4	1	11
9	2	9	2	9	-	11
10	6	4	4	6	-	10
11	2	8	4	6	-	10
12	1	8	2	7	-	9
13	1	6	1	6	-	7
14	1	4	2	3	-	5
TOTAL	34	142	69	99	8	176

*Divorced, separated, etc.

The data for the study were collected in Saskatchewan, in the Regina Public School District. In all, fourteen schools, ranging in size from five to twenty-two teachers, were visited. The mean number of teachers in the schools was approximately 12.5 with 2.4 males and 10.1 females. The schools were all elementary and were distributed in each quadrant of the city. They embraced a variety

of socio-economic areas. In Regina, the schools contain grades one through eight which in some measure accounts for the relatively high number of male teachers in the system compared with systems in other places. For example, in this sample there were thirty-four males making approximately 20 per cent of the total.

The teachers' ages ranged from under twenty years to retiring age and are listed in Table III. There were two distinct clusters; one in the range "21 to 25 years" with a total of 62, and a second in the range "Over 40 years" with a total of 51. These two combined, made up nearly two-thirds of the sample. There were almost twice as many married teachers as single teachers.

TABLE III

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF ELEMENTARY TEACHERS IN SAMPLE IN CATEGORIES OF SEX, AGE, AND MARITAL STATUS

Category	Male	Female	Total
Sex	34	142	176
Age			
1. 20 or less years	-	10	10
2. 21 to 25 years	9	53	62
3. 26 to 30 years	10	13	23
4. 31 to 40 years	11	19	30
5. Over 40 years	4	47	51
Marital Status			
1. Single	7	52	59
2. Married	26	82	108
3. Other	1	8	9

In terms of "Years of Training Credited for Salary Purposes" nearly 57 per cent of the respondents had two years or less, suggesting that the sample was not characterized by a high level of training. The distribution, shown in Table IV for "Teaching Experience" assumed a u-shaped curve having peaks of fifty-five subjects in the categories "0 to 3 years" and "Over 15 years".

TABLE IV

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF ELEMENTARY TEACHERS IN SAMPLE IN CATEGORIES OF YEARS OF FORMAL TRAINING CREDITED FOR SALARY PURPOSES, TEACHING EXPERIENCE, AND NUMBER OF FULL-TIME POSITIONS HELD

Category	Male	Female	Total
Years of Training Credited for Salary Purposes			
1. 2 years or less	4	96	100
2. 3 years	5	22	27
3. 4 years	16	14	30
4. 5 years	5	4	9
5. Over 5 years	4	6	10
Teaching Experience			
1. 0 to 3 years	3	52	55
2. 4 to 6 years	15	22	37
3. 7 to 10 years	7	10	17
4. 11 to 15 years	4	8	12
5. Over 15 years	5	50	55
Full-Time Positions held			
1. 1 position	9	62	71
2. 2 positions	11	19	30
3. 3 positions	7	24	31
4. 4 positions	4	19	23
5. Over 4 positions	3	18	21

Table V shows the number of teachers in each category of "Full-time Positions Held" and Table VI is a breakdown of the category "Over 4 Full-time Positions Held."

TABLE V

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF TEACHERS IN CATEGORIES OF FULL-TIME POSITIONS HELD

Positions Held	Number of Teachers (N = 176)
1	71
2	30
3	31
4	23
Over 4	21

TABLE VI

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF TEACHERS HOLDING FIVE OR MORE FULL-TIME POSITIONS

Positions Held	Number of Teachers (N = 21)
5	15
6	3
7	2
8	1

VI. DELIMITATIONS

The study was limited to the examination of the relationships among need structures, the level of professional orientation, the level of mobility orientation and actual mobility. Only eight of the EPPS needs were analysed even though data for all fifteen were collected. That many other variables undoubtedly exert an influence upon teachers

is readily admitted but since they were too numerous to be encompassed in one study, a selection had to be made.

The sample was delimited to a single school system and to elementary teachers only, so that some measure of control over a number of organizational and environmental variables such as school board regulations, promotional routes, requirements pertaining to qualifications, differing system sizes, salary incentives, remoteness and lack of community facilities, could be achieved.

VII. LIMITATIONS

The delimitation of the sample to the variables indicated above and to a single school system necessarily imposes limitations upon the generalizability of the results. However, this is not unusual because of the many uncontrollable variables and applies to most studies of this nature.

VIII. SUMMARY OF CHAPTER V

Chapter V was designed to outline the overall research design and the strategies which were employed in the investigation. The three main instruments which were used were described and an account given of their reliability and validity.

The problem of the measure of actual mobility was discussed and some of the difficulties were outlined. Certain procedures were adopted to overcome these and were subsequently specified. Finally, an account of the collection of the data and a description of the sample were given.

CHAPTER VI

TESTS OF THE HYPOTHESES, AND FINDINGS

I. INTRODUCTION

The aim of Chapter VI is:

1. Restatement of the sub-problems and the hypotheses derived from them.
2. Statement of the statistical tests used in the analysis of each hypothesis, along with details pertaining to the size and character of each group, the significance level, and the rejection region.
3. Presentation of the decision made regarding the support of the hypothesis by the data.

As each of the hypotheses was cast in a similar form, the data for the first three hypotheses are analysed in some detail and the remainder in a more abbreviated manner. A discussion of the supplementary analyses and the findings pertaining to them are given in the following chapter.

II. ANALYSIS OF SUB-PROBLEM 1

The first research sub-problem concerned the relationship between the needs manifested by elementary teachers and their level of professional orientation. In the light of available theory and evidence

gained from a survey of the literature, three research hypotheses were developed from the sub-problem.

Sub-problem 1

Do elementary teachers with high professional orientation scores have significantly higher scores on certain selected needs than elementary teachers with low professional orientation scores?

Hypothesis 1.1. A significant difference exists between the need Autonomy scores of elementary teachers in the highest and lowest categories of professional orientation; those in the highest category will score significantly higher on need Autonomy.

Hypothesis 1.2. A significant difference exists between the need Nurturance scores of elementary teachers in the highest and lowest categories of professional orientation; those in the highest category will score significantly higher on need Nurturance.

Hypothesis 1.3. A significant difference exists between the need Affiliation scores of elementary teachers in the highest and lowest categories of professional orientation; those in the highest category will score significantly higher on need Affiliation.

Testing Hypotheses 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3

Because the group of elementary teachers which was included in this test* was divided into three approximately equal sub-samples with $N_1 = 58$, $N_2 = 59$ and $N_3 = 59$ on the basis of their PROS scores, and since the measurement of needs Autonomy, Nurturance and Affiliation provided ordinal data at best, the Mann-Whitney U Test was selected as an appropriate statistical procedure. Table VII lists the number, range, mean and standard deviation of the PROS scores which were obtained.

---

*The format adopted for analysis of the data was based on that given in Siegel, 1956, pp. 121-2.

TABLE VII

NUMBER, RANGE, MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF PROS SCORES FOR TOTAL PROS SAMPLE AND HIGH-LOW PROS GROUPS

Group	N	Range	Mean	S.D.
Total	176	41-70	55.62	5.28
Highest	59	58-70	61.20	2.83
Lowest	58	41-53	49.82	3.02

For N_2 greater than 20, a formula is available to yield values of z (formula 6.8, Siegel, 1956, p. 123). The probability associated with the occurrence under Hypotheses 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 of values as extreme as an observed z may be determined by reference to Table A in Siegel, 1956, p. 247. Since each of the hypotheses predicts the direction of the difference, the region of rejection is one-tailed.

Table VIII shows that none of the three scores reached the necessary critical value of 1.64 necessary for the indication of a significant difference between the groups. The conclusion was thus reached that elementary teachers in the highest and lowest categories of professional orientation were not significantly different on needs Autonomy, Nurturance and Affiliation, and that Hypotheses 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 were not supported by the data.

TABLE VIII

NECESSARY CRITICAL VALUE AND Z SCORES FOR NEEDS AUTONOMY, NURTURANCE AND AFFILIATION FOR HIGH-LOW PROS GROUPS

Variable	Obtained z Score	Necessary Critical Value
Autonomy	-1.185	Equal to or greater than 1.64
Nurturance	-0.276	
Affiliation	-1.248	

III. ANALYSIS OF SUB-PROBLEM 2

Sub-problem 2 was concerned with the contention that there are differences on certain selected needs between groups characterized by varying levels of mobility orientation. From an analysis of the relevant literature and from Sub-problem 2 itself, three research hypotheses were formulated.

Sub-problem 2

> Do elementary teachers with high mobility orientation scores have significantly higher scores on certain selected needs than elementary teachers with low mobility orientation scores?
>
> Hypothesis 2.1. A significant difference exists between the need Achievement scores of elementary teachers in the highest and lowest categories of mobility orientation; those in the highest category will score significantly higher on need Achievement.
>
> Hypothesis 2.2. A significant difference exists between the need Endurance scores of elementary teachers in the highest and lowest categories of mobility orientation; those in the highest category will score significantly higher on need Endurance.
>
> Hypothesis 2.3. A significant difference exists between the need Order scores of elementary teachers in the highest and lowest categories of mobility orientation; those in the highest category will score significantly higher on need Order.

Testing Hypotheses 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3

As with the first three hypotheses, the most appropriate statistical test for the second group of hypotheses was judged to be the Mann-Whitney U Test. The sub-sample numbers for the highest and lowest groups remained at 59 and 58. Table IX below, lists the number, range, mean and standard deviation of the MAS scores which were obtained and used as a basis for dividing the sample into

three groups.

TABLE IX

NUMBER, RANGE, MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF MAS SCORES FOR TOTAL MAS SAMPLE AND HIGH-LOW MAS GROUPS

Group	N	Range	Mean	S.D.
Total	176	30-53	42.52	4.35
Highest	59	45-53	47.13	2.14
Lowest	58	30-41	37.74	2.54

Reference to Table X below, shows that none of the three scores reached a value of 1.64 necessary for the indication of a significant difference between the groups. Therefore, it was concluded that elementary teachers in the respective categories of mobility orientation were not significantly different on needs Achievement, Endurance and Order, and that Hypotheses 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 were not supported by the data.

TABLE X

NECESSARY CRITICAL VALUE AND Z SCORES FOR NEEDS ACHIEVEMENT, ENDURANCE AND ORDER FOR HIGH-LOW MAS GROUPS

Variable	Obtained z Scores	Necessary Critical Value
Achievement	-0.521	Equal to or greater than 1.64
Endurance	-1.316	
Order	-0.790	

IV. ANALYSIS OF SUB-PROBLEM 3

The third research sub-problem was concerned with the relationship between the needs manifested by elementary teachers and the amount of actual mobility in which they engaged. Four research hypotheses were formulated from the literature and the sub-problem. It was hypothesized that different levels of actual mobility would be associated with varying strengths of certain psychological needs.

Sub-problem 3

> Do elementary teachers with high actual mobility scores have significantly higher scores on certain selected needs than elementary teachers with low actual mobility scores?
>
> Hypothesis 3.1. A significant difference exists between the need Change scores of elementary teachers in the highest and lowest categories of actual mobility; those in the highest category will score significantly higher on need Change.
>
> Hypothesis 3.2. A significant difference exists between the need Autonomy scores of elementary teachers in the highest and lowest categories of actual mobility; those in the highest category will score significantly higher on need Autonomy.
>
> Hypothesis 3.3. A significant difference exists between the need Deference scores of elementary teachers in the highest and lowest categories of actual mobility; those in the lowest category will score significantly higher on need Deference.
>
> Hypothesis 3.4. A significant difference exists between the need Nurturance scores of elementary teachers in the highest and lowest categories of actual mobility; those in the lowest category will score significantly higher on need Nurturance.

Testing Hypotheses 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4

One of the main difficulties in testing these four hypotheses lay in the construction of a suitable mobility scale. In order to overcome the problem, it was decided to adopt a procedure which would result in the drawing of two sub-samples from the gross sample. The

IV. ANALYSIS OF SUB-PROBLEM 3

The third research sub-problem was concerned with the relationship between the needs manifested by elementary teachers and the amount of actual mobility in which they engaged. Four research hypotheses were formulated from the literature and the sub-problem. It was hypothesized that different levels of actual mobility would be associated with varying strengths of certain psychological needs.

Sub-problem 3

> Do elementary teachers with high actual mobility scores have significantly higher scores on certain selected needs than elementary teachers with low actual mobility scores?
>
> Hypothesis 3.1. A significant difference exists between the need Change scores of elementary teachers in the highest and lowest categories of actual mobility; those in the highest category will score significantly higher on need Change.
>
> Hypothesis 3.2. A significant difference exists between the need Autonomy scores of elementary teachers in the highest and lowest categories of actual mobility; those in the highest category will score significantly higher on need Autonomy.
>
> Hypothesis 3.3. A significant difference exists between the need Deference scores of elementary teachers in the highest and lowest categories of actual mobility; those in the lowest category will score significantly higher on need Deference.
>
> Hypothesis 3.4. A significant difference exists between the need Nurturance scores of elementary teachers in the highest and lowest categories of actual mobility; those in the lowest category will score significantly higher on need Nurturance.

Testing Hypotheses 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4

One of the main difficulties in testing these four hypotheses lay in the construction of a suitable mobility scale. In order to overcome the problem, it was decided to adopt a procedure which would result in the drawing of two sub-samples from the gross sample. The

first procedure--Test 1--was to sort out all those teachers who had had an opportunity to change their positions. The second, third, fourth and fifth categories of "Number of Years of Teaching Experience" were chosen; the reasoning being that all these teachers had had at least four or more years in which to engage in actual mobility, i.e., change their position within their school or move to another. Those with little time in the profession were eliminated. The next step was a further sorting of the sub-sample to rank them on the number of full-time positions held. The net result was a ranking of the teachers starting with those who had not changed their positions to those who had had up to six or seven changes during their careers. The numbers in the obtained groups were: $N_1 = 40$, $N_2 = 41$ and $N_3 = 40$.

The second means of testing these hypotheses--Test 2--was very similar to the procedure for Test 1, the major difference being that instead of taking all the teachers who were in categories 2-5 of "Number of Years of Teaching Experience", only the teachers in category 5--"Over 15 years"--were selected. The sub-sample then contained only experienced teachers who all had roughly the same amount of time in which to change their positions. In short, the procedure was a refinement of the one above. When this sub-sample had been sorted, the subjects were next ranked according to the number of full-time positions held. From these were chosen two groups; those who had not changed at all, N = 10, and those who had held five or more positions, N = 18. The data for these two sub-samples--for Test 1 and Test 2--were subjected to the same procedures as used above for

the first two sets of hypotheses.

An examination of the results of the two tests as shown in Table XI reveals that none of the z scores or U statistics reached the critical value necessary for the indication of a significant difference in the predicted direction. Only need Autonomy in Test 1 showed a significant difference but this was in favor of the low group rather than the high group. The conclusion was thus reached that elementary teachers in the highest and lowest categories of actual mobility did not score significantly differently on needs Change, Deference and Nurturance and that the difference on need Autonomy was not in the predicted direction. Therefore, Hypotheses 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 were not supported by the data.

TABLE XI

Z SCORES AND U STATISTICS FOR TEST 1 AND TEST 2 FOR HIGH-LOW ACTUAL MOBILITY GROUPS

Test 1 (N_1=40, N_2=40)		Test 2 (N_1=10, N_2=18)	
Variable	z	Variable	U
Change	-1.423	Change	85.0
Autonomy	-2.528*	Autonomy	84.5
Deference	-1.127	Deference	82.0
Nurturance	-1.328	Nurturance	64.0

*Significant at the .05 level

V. SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

The findings revealed that there were no significant differences in the predicted direction for the ten hypotheses of the study.

CHAPTER VII

SUPPLEMENTARY ANALYSES AND FINDINGS

I. SUPPLEMENTARY ANALYSES--HYPOTHESES 1.1, 1.2 AND 1.3

Because of the negative findings and because the PROS did not appear to be a sufficiently predictive instrument, the decision was made to use another test which would allow the PROS to demonstrate its capacity under more extreme conditions; the highest and lowest tenths, instead of thirds, were used.

When the data were subjected to Mann-Whitney U tests, U statistics of 116.5, 136.5 and 129.5 respectively, for needs Autonomy, Nurturance and Affiliation were obtained. Again, there was no support for the Hypotheses because the necessary critical value, equal to or less than 102, was not reached (Table K, Siegel, 1956, p. 227).

At this juncture, a third test was applied to the data in an attempt to investigate possible differences between another element in the sample and the high-low groups as well as to verify the results of the other tests. The data, divided on the basis of the above trichotomy but this time including the middle group with $N_1 = 58$, $N_2 = 59$ and $N_3 = 59$, were tested by means of the Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance. The resultant H statistics were 5.722, 1.078 and 1.685 for needs Autonomy, Nurturance and Affiliation. Reference to the Table of Chi Square (Siegel, 1956, p. 249) reveals that at the .05 level, a critical value equal to or greater than 2.99 is necessary for the indication of a significant difference among the groups. A comparison

of the obtained values with the critical value indicated that no significant difference was to be found among the groups for needs Nurturance and Affiliation. The difference found for need Autonomy was not in the predicted direction.

Again, because the data did not support Hypotheses 1.1, 1.2 or 1.3, an investigation of some of the aspects of the eight needs in the need profiles of those teachers categorized as high and low on professional orientation was undertaken. The means and standard deviations for each of the eight needs of the study were calculated and the needs arranged accordingly to their rank order.

TABLE XII

RANK ORDER OF EIGHT NEEDS IN TERMS OF RELATIVE STRENGTH FOR HIGH-LOW PROS GROUPS

High PROS			Low PROS		
	Variable	Mean	S.D.	Variable	Mean	S.D.
1.	Endurance	14.98	4.70	1. Affiliation	15.37	4.01
2.	Achievement	14.88	3.04	2. Deference	14.75	3.59
3.	Affiliation	14.61	3.83	3. Achievement	14.00	2.77
4.	Deference	14.33	2.88	4. Autonomy	13.93	4.59
5.	Change	14.13	4.69	5. Change	13.93	3.32
6.	Nurturance	13.77	4.30	6. Order	13.89	4.80
7.	Order	13.64	4.30	7. Nurturance	13.53	3.94
8.	Autonomy	13.18	3.21	8. Endurance	13.39	3.63

The low rank of need Autonomy was quite unexpected. Instead of being placed well to the top, as might be predicted from statements in the literature such as those by Barber (1965)* and Abrahamson

*"One of the essential attributes of the professional role . . . is autonomy." (p. 25).

of the obtained values with the critical value indicated that no significant difference was to be found among the groups for needs Nurturance and Affiliation. The difference found for need Autonomy was not in the predicted direction.

Again, because the data did not support Hypotheses 1.1, 1.2 or 1.3, an investigation of some of the aspects of the eight needs in the need profiles of those teachers categorized as high and low on professional orientation was undertaken. The means and standard deviations for each of the eight needs of the study were calculated and the needs arranged accordingly to their rank order.

TABLE XII

RANK ORDER OF EIGHT NEEDS IN TERMS OF RELATIVE STRENGTH FOR HIGH-LOW PROS GROUPS

High PROS			Low PROS		
Variable	Mean	S.D.	Variable	Mean	S.D.
1. Endurance	14.98	4.70	1. Affiliation	15.37	4.01
2. Achievement	14.88	3.04	2. Deference	14.75	3.59
3. Affiliation	14.61	3.83	3. Achievement	14.00	2.77
4. Deference	14.33	2.88	4. Autonomy	13.93	4.59
5. Change	14.13	4.69	5. Change	13.93	3.32
6. Nurturance	13.77	4.30	6. Order	13.89	4.80
7. Order	13.64	4.30	7. Nurturance	13.53	3.94
8. Autonomy	13.18	3.21	8. Endurance	13.39	3.63

The low rank of need Autonomy was quite unexpected. Instead of being placed well to the top, as might be predicted from statements in the literature such as those by Barber (1965)* and Abrahamson

*"One of the essential attributes of the professional role . . . is autonomy." (p. 25).

(1967)*, in actuality, the need ranked lowest for the teachers thought to be those who would manifest it to the highest degree. Equally unexpected was the rather low rank of need Nurturance which is another need considered to be typical of teachers, and especially of elementary teachers. Some of the studies in the literature** indicate, however, that there is conflicting evidence on whether elementary teachers are, or are not, higher on the need to give nurturance than members of the general public or other professional groups. Robinson's (1966) statement that "A professional is bound by a norm of service to represent the welfare and interests of his clients. . . ." (p. 30) suggests that professional teachers should be characterized by a service ideal. Table XII showing the rank order of teachers' needs suggests, on the other hand, that they may not be typified by a high need to give aid and assistance to the young. Jackson and Guba (1957) made an assertion similar to this and stated that ". . . teachers in general, are <u>not</u> motivated by a strong interest in social service, [or] by strong nurturant needs." (p. 180). With need Nurturance ranking only sixth for the high PROS group and seventh for the low PROS group, there appears to be some support for their remarks. When the rank orders of the eight needs were subjected to a Spearman Rank Order Correlation test, the

---

*"The more professional the orientation, [the] stronger the desire for autonomy." (p. 102).

**"Jackson and Guba (1957); Vineyard, Drinkwater and Dickison (1962); Guba, Jackson and Bidwell (1959)."

resultant coefficient was .10. This coefficient is not significant at the .05 level with an "N" of this size thus suggesting the lack of a significant correlation between the profiles of the groups.

Table XIII also lends some support to the contention made above. The teachers in the study sample had lower means on need Nurturance than the four other groups for which norms were available. This was also corroborated by use of a t-test with the high-low groups and the Edwards general adult sample. The difference in means was significant at the .001 level.

TABLE XIII

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR STUDY SAMPLE AND FOUR OTHER GROUPS FOR NEEDS AUTONOMY, NURTURANCE AND AFFILIATION

Sample	Autonomy		Nurturance		Affiliation	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Edwards (1965)						
General Adult	13.06	4.25	17.07	4.70	16.13	4.32
College	13.31	4.53	15.22	4.76	17.40	4.36
Vineyard, Drinkwater and Dickison (1962)						
Pharmacy Students	13.52	3.65	14.04	3.45	14.66	2.48
Education Students	13.24	4.48	15.09	5.57	15.32	4.64
Study Sample						
High PROS	13.18	3.21	13.77	4.30	14.61	3.83
Low PROS	13.93	4.59	13.53	3.94	15.37	4.01

An examination of the rank of need Affiliation in Table XII indicated that it was relatively high in comparison with the seven other needs. The low PROS group especially seemed to have a strong drive. The high PROS group, although not manifesting the drive quite

so highly, did place it third. However, in comparison with the four other groups, the picture for this need was not so clear-cut. As can be seen from Table XIII, the general adult sample mean and the college mean were both higher although not significantly so. The study sample did, however, score above the group of pharmacy students. Need Affiliation seems, therefore, to be a characteristic of teachers but also of some other groups.

In summary of the results for Hypotheses 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3, indications were that none of the tests supported the hypotheses.

II. SUPPLEMENTARY ANALYSES--HYPOTHESES 2.1, 2.2 AND 2.3

When the data which were collected for needs Achievement, Endurance and Order were analysed by means of the Mann-Whitney U test, the predictions embodied in Hypotheses 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 were not supported. This suggested that further analyses were necessary if a significant difference was to be found. The decision was made to subject the data to the same tests and procedures as those applied above. The sample was, accordingly, divided into ten sub-samples from which the highest and lowest were selected for examination. When the Mann-Whitney test was applied the data revealed that there were no significant differences. The obtained U values were 132.5, 149.0 and 143.0, but with a critical value equal to or less than 102 necessary for a significant difference, they were too large to support the hypotheses, even at this extreme.

The next procedure subjected the data to the Kruskal-Wallis test using the entire sample subdivided into three groups. The test

resulted in H values of 1.925, 2.830 and 3.945; values not high enough to indicate a significant result. Thus, further evidence was obtained for the rejection of Hypotheses 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3.

Because the data did not support these hypotheses, additional analyses were undertaken. As described in the conceptual framework, mobility orientation is composed of two elements or dimensions, vertical and geographical mobility. The former is concerned with positional changes whereas the latter is concerned with change of locality. By testing the MAS group divided on this basis, the possibility of discovering a significant result could be enhanced. Table XIV shows the results of the analyses which were completed for vertical and geographical mobility orientation. No result indicated a significant difference even though both dimensions were tested with Mann-Whitney and Kruskal-Wallis tests using "third" and "tenth" groups as before.

The survey of the literature on mobility orientation indicated that the person who was willing to sacrifice his personal, family or locality ties in order to take advantage of promotional opportunities, was an individual characterized by a strong achievement motivation (Deese, 1967, p. 561); who was able and willing to endure discomfort and change (Suziedelis and Steimal, 1963); and who was a good organizer attempting to order his environment (Presthus, 1962, p. 172). For these and other reasons, the three hypotheses concerned with Sub-problem 2, predicted that those elementary teachers who scored higher on the MAS would differ significantly on needs Achievement, Endurance and Order, from those who scored lower on the scale. The data did not confirm the hypotheses. The rank orders of the eight needs for the two MAS groups were calculated for the PROS groups.

TABLE XIV

RESULTS* OF ANALYSES OF NEEDS ACHIEVEMENT, ENDURANCE AND ORDER FOR VERTICAL AND GEOGRAPHICAL MOBILITY ORIENTATION

Vertical Mobility		Geographical Mobility	
Mann-Whitney U Test (N_1=58, N_2=59)			
Variable	Z	Variable	Z
Achievement	-0.581	Achievement	-0.704
Endurance	-0.936	Endurance	-0.804
Order	-0.931	Order	-0.407
Mann-Whitney U Test (N_1=17, N_2=18)			
Variable	U	Variable	U
Achievement	131.5	Achievement	151.0
Endurance	134.5	Endurance	151.0
Order	138.0	Order	121.0
Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance (N_1=58, N_2=59, N_3=59)			
Variable	H	Variable	H
Achievement	0.883	Achievement	1.791
Endurance	2.800	Endurance	0.663
Order	1.009	Order	0.146

*No result indicated a significant difference.

Table XV below shows that although need Affiliation ranked highest for both groups, needs Order and Endurance were second and third for the high MAS group, and needs Endurance and Achievement were second and third for the low group. In short, both groups appeared to be strong on a need for Affiliation, with almost as strong a need for Endurance. The MAS groups thus appeared in a somewhat favourable light; the high group members characterized by a desire to be friendly, to organize their environment, and to be able to "stick at it" until the job is done; the low group members characterized by drives to be friendly, to want to keep at it until they complete their tasks, and to accomplish a considerable amount. Further, when the rank orders of the eight needs were subjected to the Spearman Rank Order Correlation test, the resulting coefficient was .41, a coefficient not significant at the .05 level with a sample of this size, thus the correlation does not establish that the two groups have basically the same need profiles.

When the study sample groups were compared with others in Table XVI, the means of the high and low MAS groups on need Achievement were not significantly different from those of the Edwards general adult group. The means for need Endurance, however, were significantly lower (.001 level) than the Edwards general adult sample. The low MAS group was also lower than the Vineyard education students' group.

When the means of the study sample for need Order were compared with the other groups, they again were lower than the Edwards general adult sample yet higher than the other samples. For instance, the

TABLE XV

RANK ORDER OF EIGHT NEEDS IN TERMS OF RELATIVE STRENGTH FOR HIGH-LOW MAS GROUPS

High MAS			Low MAS		
Variable	Mean	S.D.	Variable	Mean	S.D.
1. Affiliation	15.22	4.02	1. Affiliation	15.12	3.77
2. Order	14.74	4.73	2. Endurance	14.63	4.19
3. Endurance	14.67	4.73	3. Achievement	14.50	2.79
4. Change	14.66	5.08	4. Change	14.12	4.71
5. Deference	14.49	3.74	5. Deference	14.05	2.67
6. Nurturance	14.45	4.02	6. Autonomy	13.53	3.17
7. Achievement	14.13	3.27	7. Order	13.34	4.32
8. Autonomy	12.77	2.95	8. Nurturance	12.96	4.42

TABLE XVI

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR STUDY SAMPLE AND FOUR OTHER GROUPS FOR NEEDS ACHIEVEMENT, ENDURANCE AND ORDER

	Achievement		Endurance		Order	
Sample	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Edwards (1965)						
General Adult	14.18	4.04	16.73	4.73	15.14	4.72
College	14.38	4.36	12.65	5.25	10.24	4.34
Vineyard, Drinkwater and Dickison (1962)						
Pharmacy Students	13.52	2.92	15.08	5.26	13.20	4.64
Education Students	13.64	4.56	14.62	4.71	10.78	3.31
Study Sample						
High MAS	14.13	3.35	14.64	4.45	14.75	4.18
Low MAS	14.50	2.79	13.63	4.32	13.34	4.19

sample means were almost one standard deviation more than the Edwards liberal arts college sample mean and Vineyard's education students' mean. The low MAS mean was significantly lower than the Edwards adult mean at the .01 level.

In summary of the results pertaining to Hypotheses 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3, none of the major tests revealed a significant difference at the .05 level, but in the case of needs Endurance and Order, there was a small indication of higher scores in the predicted direction. Compared with the general population means of Edwards' general adult norms, the study samples were approximately equal on need Achievement but significantly lower on need Order.

III. SUPPLEMENTARY ANALYSES--HYPOTHESES 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 AND 3.4

As a means of investigating the existence of differences for needs Autonomy and Change, the decision was made to subject the data to Kruskal-Wallis tests. A further analysis was carried out using all the Test 2 sample data plus the scores of the intermediate categories with $N_1 = 18$, $N_2 = 19$ and $N_3 = 18$. In addition to this analysis, the N_1 and the N_3 data for the enlarged Test 2 sample were subjected to a Mann-Whitney test. As seen in Table XVII, the supplementary test to Test 1 corroborated the difference for need Autonomy but not need Change. Further, the supplementary tests to Test 2 did not support Hypothesis 3.2. Thus, under the conditions of Test 1--using the four highest categories of "Years of Teaching Experience"--there was a significant difference for need Autonomy although not in the predicted direction. In all other instances, no such difference was found.

TABLE XVII

RESULTS OF SUPPLEMENTARY ANALYSES OF NEEDS CHANGE, AUTONOMY, DEFERENCE AND NURTURANCE

Test 1 Group Kruskal-Wallis		Test 2 Group Kruskal-Wallis		Test 2 Group Mann-Whitney	
Variable	H	Variable	H	Variable	U
Change	2.066	Change	2.190	Change	150.0
Autonomy	13.370*	Autonomy	1.136	Autonomy	139.5
Deference	1.454	Deference	1.763	Deference	136.0
Nurturance	2.540	Nurturance	0.573	Nurturance	127.0

*Significant at the .05 level but not in the predicted direction.

When the high and low actual mobility means for Deference and Nurturance were compared with the others, t-tests revealed that they were significantly different. Table XVIII below lists the means and standard deviations for the study sample and the four other groups for needs Change, Autonomy, Deference and Nurturance.

TABLE XVIII

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR STUDY SAMPLE AND FOUR OTHER GROUPS FOR NEEDS CHANGE, AUTONOMY, DEFERENCE AND NURTURANCE

	Change		Autonomy		Deference		Nurturance	
Sample	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Edwards (1965)								
General Adult	15.05	4.75	13.06	4.25	14.45	3.87	17.07	4.70
College	16.35	4.88	13.37	4.53	11.80	3.71	15.22	4.76
Vineyard Drinkwater and Dickison (1962)								
Pharmacy Students	15.30	2.62	13.52	3.65	12.54	3.02	14.04	3.45
Education Students	15.28	4.60	13.24	4.48	12.70	3.74	15.09	5.57
Study Sample								
High Act. Mobility	16.20	4.80	13.25	4.50	11.70	3.65	15.30	4.80
Low Act. Mobility	16.40	4.76	13.15	4.45	11.21	3.56	15.05	4.71

Table XIX below shows the means, standard deviations, t-scores, and significance of the differences for the total teacher sample and the Edwards general adult sample.

TABLE XIX

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND t-SCORES FOR TOTAL TEACHER AND EDWARDS' GENERAL ADULT SAMPLES

Variable	Sample				t
	Total Teachers		Edwards' General Adult		
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
1. Autonomy	13.23	4.24	13.06	4.25	.53
2. Nurturance	15.22	3.61	17.07	4.70	6.61*
3. Affiliation	14.94	3.87	16.13	4.32	3.97*
4. Achievement	14.59	3.30	14.18	4.04	1.64
5. Endurance	14.83	4.55	16.73	4.73	5.43*
6. Order	14.67	4.37	15.14	4.72	1.42
7. Change	16.29	3.59	15.05	4.75	1.43
8. Deference	11.84	3.74	14.45	3.87	9.00*

*Significant at the .01 level.

IV. DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

An analysis, based on a series of t-tests of the means of the total teacher sample and the Edwards general adult sample, and reported in Table XIX, revealed that for needs Autonomy, Affiliation, Achievement, Order and Change, there were no significant differences between the two groups.

With needs Endurance, Deference and Nurturance, however, significant differences beyond the .05 level were found. The analysis showed that the study sample as a whole was significantly lower on each of these needs. In regard to need Endurance, the low values were in conflict with the findings of Getzels and Jackson (1957), and Jackson and Guba (1957) who found that teachers were characterized by need Endurance scores higher than the Edwards norms. The same disparity of results between the total teacher

sample was found for the study of Dunkin (1968) for need Deference. He noted teachers to be higher than the Edwards general adult sample. On the other hand, the study data on this need corroborated the results given by Tobin (1956), Thorpe (1958) and Getzels and Jackson (1963). These researchers showed their total teacher samples had significantly lower values than the Edwards group. The significantly low need Nurturance scores which were revealed by the analysis were in keeping with the findings of Dunkin (1968) and Jackson and Guba (1957). The differences of results may have been due to factors such as cultural or age disparities.

In summary, the t-test analysis of the total study sample and the Edwards general adult sample showed differences on needs Endurance, Deference and Nurturance; the study teachers had significantly lower means.

V. SUMMARY OF CHAPTER VII

Chapter VII was designed to describe the additional tests which were used to investigate the three groups of hypotheses of the study.

The sizes of the sub-samples, the kind of statistical test used, and a discussion of the decision associated with each test were given. Finally, came a further discussion of the findings. There were no significant differences in the predicted direction in the needs of the teachers classified on the basis of high and low professional orientation, mobility orientation, and actual mobility. The data for Hypothesis 1.1 showed a significant difference although not as predicted. With Hypothesis 3.2--need Autonomy--the data revealed that under the conditions of Test 1 there was a significant difference although not in the predicted direction. Under the conditions of Test 2, this difference was not found.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

Introduction and Purpose

This study was an attempt to discover whether different levels of professional orientation, mobility orientation and actual mobility are associated with varying strengths of certain selected psychological needs manifested by elementary teachers. If some of the relationships which exist among these elements could be determined and investigated, then information might be forthcoming which could be useful to teachers and administrators in the operation and administration of schools. The information might also be useful in the recruitment, selection and placement of teaching personnel.

The Data

One hundred and seventy-six teachers from fourteen urban schools in the Regina Public School district adequately completed questionnaires which yielded measurements of the levels of professional and mobility orientation, actual mobility and the relative strengths of fifteen manifest needs. Of the fifteen needs, eight were utilized in the study. The principal instruments which were used were the Professional Role Orientation Scale, the Mobility Achievement Scale and Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. An actual mobility scale was constructed for the measurement of the mobility engaged in by the teachers.

The obtained data were subjected to a series of statistical techniques of which the Mann-Whitney U test and the Kruskal-Wallis

Analysis of Variance by Ranks test were the most useful.

II. FINDINGS

Introduction

This section deals with the ten hypotheses which were developed for the study and briefly discusses the findings associated with them. The inferences drawn from the findings are contained in the section below entitled "Conclusions and Implications."

Hypotheses 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3

The first three hypotheses predicted that those elementary teachers with a higher level of professional orientation would score significantly higher than teachers with a lower level of professional orientation, on needs Autonomy, Nurturance and Affiliation, respectively. These hypotheses were not supported by the data.

Hypotheses 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3

The next three hypotheses stated that those elementary teachers with a higher level of mobility orientation would score significantly higher than teachers with a lower level of mobility orientation, on needs Achievement, Order and Endurance, respectively. No significant differences were found between the two groups for these needs.

When the data were divided on the basis of vertical and geographical mobility orientation and subjected to the same tests, no significant differences between the groups were revealed by the results.

Hypotheses 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4

Hypotheses 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 proposed that those teachers scoring higher on actual mobility would score significantly higher than those teachers scoring lower on actual mobility, on needs Change, Autonomy, Deference and Nurturance respectively. The four hypotheses were not confirmed by the data.

In the supplementary analyses of Hypotheses 1.1 and 3.2 dealing with need Autonomy, significant differences were found although not in the predicted direction. Another test confirmed the difference but two others did not.

III. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The conclusions presented here were arrived at on the basis of the evidence provided by the study:

1. Different levels of professional orientation were not associated with significant differences in the strengths of needs Nurturance, Affiliation, and Autonomy as predicted from the literature.

2. Varying levels of mobility orientation were independent of significant differences in the strengths of needs Achievement, Endurance and Order.

3. Different amounts of actual mobility were not associated with significant differences in the strengths of needs Change, Affiliation and Nurturance.

The findings and conclusions of the study suggest some implications for teachers and administrators. Because the data

indicate that teachers have low achievement motivation, and because studies such as those by Dunkin (1968) imply that they have to learn to lower their achievement drives under the influence of occupational press, measures should be taken--where necessary--to alter the classroom situation and the administrative set-up so that teachers are encouraged and given opportunities to satisfy their achievement needs. This would perhaps result in an improvement of educational standards.

Further, the findings indicated that the teachers are lower than the adult population (Edwards, 1965) on their needs for Nurturance and Endurance. If this is correct, and if higher values for these needs are desirable, then there is a necessity for a closer look at recruitment and selection techniques. They may not be supplying the types of teachers who should act as models for our children. On the other hand, the data show that the teachers are very similar to the general adult population on other needs and do not seem to have some of the rather undesirable traits suggested by Jackson and Guba (1957) and by Campbell (1968).

The high position of needs Achievement and Endurance in the need profiles of teachers characterized by a higher level of professional orientation implies that if administrators want to encourage these "good" teachers to remain in the profession, they should provide opportunities for them to satisfy these needs and to become even more professional.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of the study and the conclusions drawn from them reveal the following possibilities for further research.

1. The study might be replicated using a sample drawn from more than one level of education. A suggestion would be to include elementary, high school, vocational education, technical college and university teachers. In this way, two things might be accomplished; (a) the sample might be more representative of teachers in general and, (b) the respondents might be more heterogeneous in their needs and orientation.

2. Professional orientation, mobility orientation and actual mobility are likely areas of research in themselves and a study of the relationships among them might yield useful information for administrators.

3. A study using some of the same instruments might be undertaken in the investigation of the relationships among manifest needs, job satisfaction, effectiveness and different levels of education, e.g., elementary, secondary.

4. An analysis* of the data obtained by the PROS and the EPPS revealed a complete lack of correlation between the two. Since the social desirability factor in the EPPS has been controlled, this factor may have been operative in the PROS scores. An investigation of the PROS might be carried out to refine and develop it as an instrument.

---

*This analysis was carried out by Dr. D. L. Schaeffer of the Department of Psychology, University of Alberta, Edmonton.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abrahamson, M. The Professional in the Organization. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1967.

Andrews, J. "Administrative Significance of Psychological Differences Between Secondary Teachers of Different Subject Matter Fields," Alberta Journal of Educational Research. 3(December, 1957), 199-208.

Appley, M. H. and G. Moeller, "Conformity Behavior and Personality Variables in College Women," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. 66, 3(1963), 284-290.

Asch, S. E. Social Psychology. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1952.

Barber, B. "Some Problems in the Sociology of the Professions," in The Professions in America. (K. S. Lynn ed.), Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1965.

Bendig, A. W. "Objective Measures of Needs and Course Achievement in Introductory Psychology," Journal of General Psychology. 59(July, 1958), 51-57.

Bjerstedt, A. Fifth Mental Measurements Yearbook. (O.K. Buros, ed.) New Jersey: Gryphon Press, 1959, 117-118.

Boring, G. E., H. S. Langfeld, and H. P. Weld. Foundations of Psychology. New York: Wiley, 1948.

Bruce, W. C. "Teacher Turnover," The American School Board Journal. CXLIX (November, 1964) 29.

Butler, T. M. "Satisfactions of Beginning Teachers," Clearing House. XXXVI (September, 1961), 11-13.

Campbell, R. F. and R. T. Gregg (eds.). Administrative Behavior in Education. New York: Harper Bros., 1957.

Campbell, W. J. "The Role and Status of Teachers' Colleges Within a System of Tertiary Education." Paper presented at the Fourth Canberra Seminar on Administrative Studies, 15th-17th May, 1967. Research School of Social Sciences, Australian National University, 1967. In M. J. Dunkin, "The Need Structure of Teachers Varying in Experience and Job Satisfaction," The Journal of Educational Administration. VI, 1(May, 1968), 41-51.

Carlson, R. O. Executive Succession and Organizational Change: Place-bound and Career-bound Superintendents of Schools. Chicago: Midwest Administration Centre, University of Chicago, 1962.

Chase, F. S. "Factors for Satisfaction in Teaching," Phi Delta Kappan. XXXIII (November, 1951), 127-132.

Coch, L. and J. R. French. "Overcoming Resistance to Change," Human Relations. 4, 1(1948), 512-533.

Cohen, A. R. "Upward Communications in Experimentally Created Hierarchies," Human Relations. IX (1958), 41-54.

Conville, R. S. and S. A. Anderson. "Teacher Turnover in Coles County, Illinois," Educational Administration and Supervision. XLII (January, 1956).

Corwin, R. G. The Development of an Instrument for Examining Staff Conflicts in the Public Schools. Columbus: Ohio State University, 1963.

Crow, L. D. Psychology of Human Adjustment. New York: A. A. Knopf, 1967.

Deese, J. General Psychology. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1967.

Dipboye, W. J. and W. F. Anderson. "Occupational Stereotypes and Manifest Needs of High School Students," Journal of Counselling Psychology. 8, 4(1961), 296-304.

Dunkin, M. J. "The Need Structure of Teachers Varying in Experience and Job Satisfaction," The Journal of Educational Administration. VI, 1(May, 1968), 41-51.

Dunnette, M. D., W. K. Kirchner, and J. de Gidio. "Relations Among Scores on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, California Psychological Inventory and the Strong Vocational Interest Blank for an Industrial Sample," Journal of Applied Psychology. 42 (June, 1959), 176-181.

Edwards, A. L. Edwards Personal Preference Schedule Manual. (Revised ed.). New York: Psychological Corporation, 1965.

Fiedler, F. E. A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness. Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Fisher, D. D. "Reducing Teacher Turnover," Michigan Educational Review. XL (January, 1963), 74-80.

Francoeur, K. Factors of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction in the Teaching Profession. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1963.

Friedenberg, E. Z. Coming of Age in America. New York: Random House, 1963.

Gebhardt, G. G. and D. P. Hoyt, "Personality Needs of Under- and Over-achieving Freshmen," Journal of Applied Psychology. 42 (April, 1958), 125-128.

Getzels, J. W. and P. W. Jackson. "The Teacher's Personality and Characteristics," Handbook of Research on Teaching. N. L. Gage (ed.). Chicago: Rand, McNally, 1963.

Gray, J. T. Manifest Needs in Secondary Teachers, Accountants and Mechanical Engineers. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of Houston, Texas, 1962.

Greene, G. E. The Extent and Causes of Turnover Among Secondary School Teachers in the Central Schools of New York State for the Year, 1961-2. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Cornell University, 1964.

Griffiths, D. E., S. Goldman, and W. McFarland. "Teacher Mobility in New York City," Educational Administration Quarterly. I(Winter, 1965), 142-149.

Grisvold, D. "A Validity Study of the Autonomy and Deference Sub-scales of the EPPS," Journal of Consulting Psychology. 22, 6(1958), 445-447.

Grossack, M. M. "Some Personality Characteristics of Southern Negro Students," Journal of Social Psychology. 46(1957), 125-131.

Guba, E. G., P. W. Jackson, and B. Bidwell. "Occupational Choice and the Teaching Career," Education Research Bulletin. 38(January, 1959), 1-12.

Haire, M. Psychology in Management. (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

Halpin, A. W. The Leader Behavior of School Superintendents. Columbus: Ohio State University, 1956.

Henry, J. "Docility, or Giving Teacher What She Wants," Readings in the Socio-cultural Foundations of Education. (J. H. Chilcott, N. C. Greenberg, and H. B. Wilson, eds.). Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing, 1968.

Henry, W. E. "The Business Executive - The Psychodynamics of a Social Role," in T. M. Newcombe, Social Psychology. New York: Dryden, 1956.

Hill, P. W. "How to Secure and Retain Good Teachers," Education Digest. XXIV (October, 1958).

Hohn, E. G. A Study of the Causes of Teacher Transfer in a School System. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1964.

Horst, P. and C. E. Wright. "The Comparative Reliability of Personality Appraisal," The Journal of Clinical Psychology. 15(October, 1959), 388-391.

Hrynyk, N. P. Correlates of Professional Role Orientation in Teaching. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1966.

Izard, C. "Personality Characteristics Associated with Resistance to Change," Journal of Consulting Psychology. 24, 5(1960), 437-440.

Jackson, P. W., and E. G. Guba. "The Need Structure of In-service Teachers: an Occupational Analysis," The School Review. 65(Summer, 1957), 176-196.

Klett, C. J. "Performance of High School Students on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule," Journal of Consulting Psychology. 21, 1(1957), 68-72.

Koponen, A. The Influence of Demographic Factors on Responses to the EPPS. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Columbia University, New York, 1957.

Korman, M. and F. Caltharpe. "Transparency in the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule," Journal of Consulting Psychology. 26(August, 1962), 378-382.

Krech, D., R. S. Crutchfield, and E. L. Ballachey. The Individual in Society. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Krug, R. E. "Over- and Underachievement and the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule," Journal of Applied Psychology. 43(April, 1959).

Levinson, H. The Exceptional Executive: A Psychological Conception. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 1968.

Lipham, J. M. "Personality Variables of Effective Administrators," Administrator's Notebook. IX (September, 1960), 1-4.

Lundrigan, J. H. Factors Related to Interschool Mobility Among Certificated Teachers in Newfoundland. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1966.

MacKay, D. A. and E. Miklos. Systems Analysis Project. Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1968.

Mann, J. H. "Self-ratings and the EPPS," Journal of Applied Psychology. 42(August, 1958), 267-268.

McDonald, R. L. and M. D. Gynther. "Nonintellectual Factors Related With Performance in Medical School," Journal of Genetic Psychology. 103(1963), 185-193.

Merton, R. "Bureaucratic Structure and Personality," Social Theory and Social Structure. (Revised ed.). Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957.

Morris, K. T. A Comparative Study of Selected Needs, Values, and Motives of Science and Non-Science Teachers. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, 1963.

Morton, J. "An Investigation into the Effects of an Adult Reading Efficiency Course," Occupational Psychology. 33(October, 1959), 222-237.

Murray, H. A. Explorations in Personality. New York: Science Editions, 1938.

Otto, H. J. "Principal Preparation at the Crossroads," Educational Leadership. 13, 1(October, 1955).

Pool, D. A. The Relation of Personality Needs to Vocational Counselling Outcome. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Texas, Austin, 1963.

Presthus, R. V. The Organizational Society. New York: Random House, 1962.

Radcliffe, J. A. The Sixth Mental Measurement Yearbook. (O. K. Buros, ed.). New Jersey: Gryphon Press, 1965, 195-200.

Reinhardt, E. and E. K. Lawson. "Experienced Teachers View Their Schools," Educational Administration and Supervision. XLV (January, 1959).

Reissman, L. "Levels of Aspiration and Social Class," American Sociological Review. 18(1953), 233-242.

Robin, S. S. Executive Performance and Attitudes Toward Mobility. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Ohio State University, 1957.

Robinson, N. A Study of Professional Role Orientations of Teachers and Principals and Their Relationship to Bureaucratic Characteristics of School Organizations. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1966.

Roethlisberger, F. J. and W. J. Dickson. Management and the Worker. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 1941.

Savage, W. W. Interpersonal and Group Relations in Educational Administration. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman, 1968.

Scandrette, O. "Differential Need Patterns of Women Elementary and Secondary Level Student Teachers," Journal of Educational Research. 55, 8(1962), 376-379.

Scharf, M. An Investigation of the Relationship Between the Professional Role Orientation and Social Structure of Teacher Groups. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1967.

Seeman, M. "Organizations and Powerlessness : A Test of the Mediation Hypothesis," American Sociological Review. 29(April, 1964), 216-226.

Seeman, M. "Social Mobility and Administrative Behavior," American Sociological Review. 23(1958), 633-642.

Seeman, M. and F. B. Silberstein. "Social Mobility and Prejudice," American Journal of Sociology. 65(November, 1959), 258-264.

Shaffer, L. F. The Fifth Mental Measurement Yearbook. (O. K. Buros, ed.). New Jersey: Gryphon Press, 1959, 119-120.

Sheldon, M., J. M. Coale, and R. Copple. "Concurrent Validity of the 'Warm Teacher Scale'," Journal of Educational Psychology. 50(1959), 37-40.

Sherif, M. and C. Sherif. An Outline of Social Psychology. New York: Harper, 1952.

Siegel, S. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1956.

Spangler, D. P. and C. W. Thomas. "The Effects of Age, Sex and Physical Disability Upon Manifest Needs," Journal of Counselling Psychology. 9, 4(1962), 313-319.

Stricker, L. J. The Sixth Mental Measurement Yearbook. (O. K. Buros, ed.). New Jersey: Gryphon Press, 1965, 200-207.

Strother, C. R. and K. W. Schaie. "Age Differences in Personality: A Comparison of Young and Old Groups of Superior Ability," Abstract. American Psychologist. 10(August, 1955), 339.

Suziedelis, A. and R. J. Steimal. "The Relationship of Need Hierarchies to Inventoried Interests," Personnel and Guidance Journal. 42(1963), 393-396.

Tannenbaum, A. S. "Control in Organizations: Individual Adjustment and Organizational Performance," Administrative Science Quarterly. 7(1962-3), 237-257.

Thomas, W. P. A Study of Factors Associated With the Retention of Teachers in Selected Public School Systems in Cuyahoga County, Ohio. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Western Reserve University, 1964.

Thorpe, J. A. "A Study of Personality Variables Among Successful Women Students and Teachers of Physical Education," The Research Quarterly of the American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 1958, 83-92.

Tobin, W. W. Use of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule in Establishing Personality Profiles for Teachers and Education Students. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Washington, 1956.

Vineyard, E. E., R. Drinkwater and W. L. Dickison. "Teacher Education and Pharmacy Students : A Comparison of Need Structure," Journal of Teacher Education. 13(1962), 409-413.

Weber, C. A. Personal Problems of School Administrators. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1954.

Woodward, R. S. Dynamics of Behavior. New York: Holt, 1958.

A P P E N D I X

INSTRUMENTS USED IN THE STUDY

PART ONE--GENERAL INFORMATION

DIRECTIONS: Pick the number which best indicates your choice.

1. SEX

   1. Male
   2. Female

2. AGE

   1. 20 or less years
   2. 21 to 25 years
   3. 26 to 30 years
   4. 31 to 40 years
   5. Over 40 years

3. MARITAL STATUS

   1. Single
   2. Married
   3. Other

4. ACADEMIC AND PROFESSIONAL TRAINING

   For how many years of formal training are you being credited for salary purposes?

   1. 2 years or less
   2. 3 years
   3. 4 years
   4. 5 years
   5. Over 5 years

5. TEACHING EXPERIENCE

   1. 0 to 3 years
   2. 4 to 6 years
   3. 7 to 10 years
   4. 11 to 15 years
   5. Over 15 years

6. POSITIONS HELD

   How many full-time positions have you held since you started teaching?

   1. 1 position
   2. 2 positions
   3. 3 positions
   4. 4 positions
   5. Over 4 positions (please specify here how many) ☐

PARTS TWO AND THREE

DIRECTIONS: Pick the number which best indicates your choice.

1. (SA) Strongly Agree
   2. (A) Agree
   3. (UND) Undecided
   4. (DIS) Disagree
   5. (SD) Strongly Disagree

PART TWO--ROLE SCALE

7. It should be permissible for a teacher to violate a rule, if it is felt that the best interest of the student will be served.

(SA) (A) (UND) (DIS) (SD)

8. Unless a teacher is satisfied that it is best for the student, he should not carry out the order which he has been given.

(SA) (A) (UND) (DIS) (SD)

9. A good teacher should not do anything that may jeopardize the interests of the students, regardless of who gives the directive or what the rule states.

(SA) (A) (UND) (DIS) (SD)

10. Teachers should try to live up to what they think are the standards of the profession, even if the administration or the community does not seem to respect them.

(SA) (A) (UND) (DIS) (SD)

11. In view of the teacher shortage, it should be permissible to hire teachers with letters of permission.

(SA) (A) (UND) (DIS) (SD)

12. A teacher should try to put the standards and ideals of good teaching into practice, even if the rules or procedures of the school discourage it.

(SA) (A) (UND) (DIS) (SD)

13. Teachers should subscribe to, and read diligently, the standard professional journals.

(SA) (A) (UND) (DIS) (SD)

14. A teacher should be an active member of at least one specialist association.

(SA) (A) (UND) (DIS) (SD)

15. A teacher should consistently make use of ideas from the best educational practices, even though the administration prefers other views.

(SA) (A) (UND) (DIS) (SD)

16. The major skill which a teacher should develop is an acquaintance with the subject matter.

(SA) (A) (UND) (DIS) (SD)

17. Teachers should be evaluated primarily on the basis of their knowledge of the subject that they teach, and on the basis of their ability to communicate it.

(SA) (A) (UND) (DIS) (SD)

18. Schools should hire no one to teach unless the person holds at least a bachelor's degree in education.

(SA) (A) (UND) (DIS) (SD)

19. One primary criterion of a good school should be the degree of respect that it commands from other teachers around the province.

(SA) (A) (UND) (DIS) (SD)

20. Teachers should be able to make their own decisions about problems that come up in the classroom.

(SA) (A) (UND) (DIS) (SD)

21. The ultimate authority over the major educational decisions should be exercised by qualified teachers.

(SA) (A) (UND) (DIS) (SD)

22. Small matters should not have to be referred to someone higher up for a final answer.

(SA) (A) (UND) (DIS) (SD)

PART THREE--MOBILITY SCALE

23. I'd probably turn down a substantial advancement if it involved being away from the family a good deal.

(SA) (A) (UND) (DIS) (SD)

24. I wouldn't let my friendship ties in a community stand in the way of moving on to a better job.

(SA) (A) (UND) (DIS) (SD)

25. One thing that would keep me from moving up is the thought of the increased responsibility breathing down my neck in the better jobs.

(SA) (A) (UND) (DIS) (SD)

26. I would probably turn down a position that would allow me less freedom to express my views on political matters.

(SA) (A) (UND) (DIS) (SD)

27. I'd turn down a job that might be a real stepping stone, if the job was one where you couldn't try out your own ideas.

(SA) (A) (UND) (DIS) (SD)

28. The man who says he isn't out to "get ahead" in his field is either kidding himself or trying to kid others.

(SA) (A) (UND) (DIS) (SD)

29. Generally speaking, if a person stays on in one of the smaller jobs for many years, it's likely he wouldn't be much even if he got promoted.

(SA) (A) (UND) (DIS) (SD)

30. I'd be all in favor of staying with a job that might never get me much prestige as a "big-shot" but was a good bet as far as peace of mind was concerned.

(SA) (A) (UND) (DIS) (SD)

31. I wouldn't take a promotion, no matter how big an improvement it was for me, if it meant endangering my health.

(SA) (A) (UND) (DIS) (SD)

32. A person must be willing to put off having children for awhile, if he wants to be ready to take advantage of the opportunities for advancement.

(SA) (A) (UND) (DIS) (SD)

33. I wouldn't let being a "stranger" for awhile keep me from moving every so often to a higher position in a new community.

(SA) (A) (UND) (DIS) (SD)

34. I've more or less had a long-range plan for myself, and moving every now and then to get new experience is part of it.

(SA) (A) (UND) (DIS) (SD)

35. It's worth considerable effort to assure one's self of a good name with the right kind of people.

(SA) (A) (UND) (DIS) (SD)

36. I really prefer to put my roots in solid in a community, rather than move as the chances for advancement come along.

(SA) (A) (UND) (DIS) (SD)

Edwards Personal Preference Schedule

Allen L. Edwards, University of Washington

DIRECTIONS

This schedule consists of a number of pairs of statements about things that you may or may not like; about ways in which you may or may not feel. Look at the example below.

A I like to talk about myself to others.

B I like to work toward some goal that I have set for myself.

Which of these two statements is more characteristic of what you like? If you like "talking about yourself to others" more than you like "working toward some goal that you have set for yourself," then you should choose A over B. If you like "working toward some goal that you have set for yourself" more than you like "talking about yourself to others," then you should choose B over A.

You may like both A and B. In this case, you would have to choose between the two and you should choose the one that you like better. If you dislike both A and B, then you should choose the one that you dislike less.

Some of the pairs of statements in the schedule have to do with your likes, such as A and B above. Other pairs of statements have to do with how you feel. Look at the example below.

A I feel depressed when I fail at something.

B I feel nervous when giving a talk before a group.

Which of these two statements is more characteristic of how you feel? If "being depressed when you fail at something" is more characteristic of you than "being nervous when giving a talk before a group," then you should choose A over B. If B is more characteristic of you than A, then you should choose B over A.

If both statements describe how you feel, then you should choose the one which you think is more characteristic. If neither statement accurately describes how you feel, then you should choose the one which you consider to be less inaccurate.

Your choice, in each instance, should be in terms of what you like and how you feel at the present time, and not in terms of what you think you should like or how you think you should feel. This is not a test. There are no right or wrong answers. Your choices should be a description of your own personal likes and feelings. Make a choice for every pair of statements; do not skip any.

The pairs of statements on the following pages are similar to the examples given above. Read each pair of statements and pick out the one statement that better describes what you like or how you feel. Make no marks in the booklet. On the separate answer sheet are numbers corresponding to the numbers of the pairs of statements. Check to be sure you are marking for the same item number as the item you are reading in the booklet.

If your answer sheet is printed in BLACK ink:	If your answer sheet is printed in OTHER THAN BLACK ink:
For each numbered item draw a circle around the A or B to indicate the statement you have chosen.	For each numbered item fill in the space for A or B as shown in the Directions on the answer sheet.

Do not turn this page until the examiner tells you to start.

Printed in U.S.A. **The Psychological Corporation, New York, N.Y.** 67-170TB
Copyright in Great Britain

1 A I like to help my friends when they are in trouble.
B I like to do my very best in whatever I undertake.

2 A I like to find out what great men have thought about various problems in which I am interested.
B I would like to accomplish something of great significance.

3 A Any written work that I do I like to have precise, neat, and well organized.
B I would like to be a recognized authority in some job, profession, or field of specialization.

4 A I like to tell amusing stories and jokes at parties.
B I would like to write a great novel or play.

5 A I like to be able to come and go as I want to.
B I like to be able to say that I have done a difficult job well.

6 A I like to solve puzzles and problems that other people have difficulty with.
B I like to follow instructions and to do what is expected of me.

7 A I like to experience novelty and change in my daily routine.
B I like to tell my superiors that they have done a good job on something, when I think they have.

8 A I like to plan and organize the details of any work that I have to undertake.
B I like to follow instructions and to do what is expected of me.

9 A I like people to notice and to comment upon my appearance when I am out in public.
B I like to read about the lives of great men.

10 A I like to avoid situations where I am expected to do things in a conventional way.
B I like to read about the lives of great men.

11 A I would like to be a recognized authority in some job, profession, or field of specialization.
B I like to have my work organized and planned before beginning it.

12 A I like to find out what great men have thought about various problems in which I am interested.
B If I have to take a trip, I like to have things planned in advance.

13 A I like to finish any job or task that I begin.
B I like to keep my things neat and orderly on my desk or workspace.

14 A I like to tell other people about adventures and strange things that have happened to me.
B I like to have my meals organized and a definite time set aside for eating.

15 A I like to be independent of others in deciding what I want to do.
B I like to keep my things neat and orderly on my desk or workspace.

16 A I like to be able to do things better than other people can.
B I like to tell amusing stories and jokes at parties.

17 A I like to conform to custom and to avoid doing things that people I respect might consider unconventional.
B I like to talk about my achievements.

18 A I like to have my life so arranged that it runs smoothly and without much change in my plans.
B I like to tell other people about adventures and strange things that have happened to me.

19 A I like to read books and plays in which sex plays a major part.
B I like to be the center of attention in a group.

20 A I like to criticize people who are in a position of authority.
B I like to use words which other people often do not know the meaning of.

21 A I like to accomplish tasks that others recognize as requiring skill and effort.
B I like to be able to come and go as I want to.

22 A I like to praise someone I admire.
B I like to feel free to do what I want to do.

23 A I like to keep my letters, bills, and other papers neatly arranged and filed according to some system.
B I like to be independent of others in deciding what I want to do.

24 A I like to ask questions which I know no one will be able to answer.
B I like to criticize people who are in a position of authority.

25 A I get so angry that I feel like throwing and breaking things.
B I like to avoid responsibilities and obligations.

26 A I like to be successful in things undertaken.
B I like to form new friendships.

27 A I like to follow instructions and to do what is expected of me.
B I like to have strong attachments with my friends.

28 A Any written work that I do I like to have precise, neat, and well organized.
B I like to make as many friends as I can.

29 A I like to tell amusing stories and jokes at parties.
B I like to write letters to my friends.

30 A I like to be able to come and go as I want to.
B I like to share things with my friends.

31 A I like to solve puzzles and problems that other people have difficulty with.
B I like to judge people by why they do something—not by what they actually do.

32 A I like to accept the leadership of people I admire.
B I like to understand how my friends feel about various problems they have to face.

33 A I like to have my meals organized and a definite time set aside for eating.
B I like to study and to analyze the behavior of others.

34 A I like to say things that are regarded as witty and clever by other people.
B I like to put myself in someone else's place and to imagine how I would feel in the same situation.

35 A I like to feel free to do what I want to do.
B I like to observe how another individual feels in a given situation.

36 A I like to accomplish tasks that others recognize as requiring skill and effort.
B I like my friends to encourage me when I meet with failure.

37 A When planning something, I like to get suggestions from other people whose opinions I respect.
B I like my friends to treat me kindly.

38 A I like to have my life so arranged that it runs smoothly and without much change in my plans.
B I like my friends to feel sorry for me when I am sick.

39 A I like to be the center of attention in a group.
B I like my friends to make a fuss over me when I am hurt or sick.

40 A I like to avoid situations where I am expected to do things in a conventional way.
B I like my friends to sympathize with me and to cheer me up when I am depressed.

41 A I would like to write a great novel or play.
B When serving on a committee, I like to be appointed or elected chairman.

42 A When I am in a group, I like to accept the leadership of someone else in deciding what the group is going to do.
B I like to supervise and to direct the actions of other people whenever I can.

43 A I like to keep my letters, bills, and other papers neatly arranged and filed according to some system.
B I like to be one of the leaders in the organizations and groups to which I belong.

44 A I like to ask questions which I know no one will be able to answer.
B I like to tell other people how to do their jobs.

45 A I like to avoid responsibilities and obligations.
B I like to be called upon to settle arguments and disputes between others.

46 A I would like to be a recognized authority in some job, profession, or field of specialization.
B I feel guilty whenever I have done something I know is wrong.

47 A I like to read about the lives of great men.
B I feel that I should confess the things that I have done that I regard as wrong.

48 A I like to plan and organize the details of any work that I have to undertake.
B When things go wrong for me, I feel that I am more to blame than anyone else.

49 A I like to use words which other people often do not know the meaning of.
B I feel that I am inferior to others in most respects.

50 A I like to criticize people who are in a position of authority.
B I feel timid in the presence of other people I regard as my superiors.

51 A I like to do my very best in whatever I undertake.
B I like to help other people who are less fortunate than I am.

52 A I like to find out what great men have thought about various problems in which I am interested.
B I like to be generous with my friends.

53 A I like to make a plan before starting in to do something difficult.
B I like to do small favors for my friends.

54 A I like to tell other people about adventures and strange things that have happened to me.
B I like my friends to confide in me and to tell me their troubles.

55 A I like to say what I think about things.
B I like to forgive my friends who may sometimes hurt me.

56 A I like to be able to do things better than other people can.
B I like to eat in new and strange restaurants.

57 A I like to conform to custom and to avoid doing things that people I respect might consider unconventional.
B I like to participate in new fads and fashions.

58 A I like to have my work organized and planned before beginning it.
B I like to travel and to see the country.

59 A I like people to notice and to comment upon my appearance when I am out in public.
B I like to move about the country and to live in different places.

60 A I like to be independent of others in deciding what I want to do.
B I like to do new and different things.

61 A I like to be able to say that I have done a difficult job well.
B I like to work hard at any job I undertake.

62 A I like to tell my superiors that they have done a good job on something, when I think they have.
B I like to complete a single job or task at a time before taking on others.

63 A If I have to take a trip, I like to have things planned in advance.
B I like to keep working at a puzzle or problem until it is solved.

64 A I sometimes like to do things just to see what effect it will have on others.
B I like to stick at a job or problem even when it may seem as if I am not getting anywhere with it.

65 A I like to do things that other people regard as unconventional.
B I like to put in long hours of work without being distracted.

66 A I would like to accomplish something of great significance.
B I like to kiss attractive persons of the opposite sex.

67 A I like to praise someone I admire.
B I like to be regarded as physically attractive by those of the opposite sex.

68 A I like to keep my things neat and orderly on my desk or workspace.
B I like to be in love with someone of the opposite sex.

69 A I like to talk about my achievements.
B I like to listen to or to tell jokes in which sex plays a major part.

70 A I like to do things in my own way and without regard to what others may think.
B I like to read books and plays in which sex plays a major part.

71 A I would like to write a great novel or play.
B I like to attack points of view that are contrary to mine.

72 A When I am in a group, I like to accept the leadership of someone else in deciding what the group is going to do.
B I feel like criticizing someone publicly if he deserves it.

73 A I like to have my life so arranged that it runs smoothly and without much change in my plans.
B I get so angry that I feel like throwing and breaking things.

74 A I like to ask questions which I know no one will be able to answer.
B I like to tell other people what I think of them.

75 A I like to avoid responsibilities and obligations.
B I feel like making fun of people who do things that I regard as stupid.

76 A I like to be loyal to my friends.
B I like to do my very best in whatever I undertake.

77 A I like to observe how another individual feels in a given situation.
B I like to be able to say that I have done a difficult job well.

78 A I like my friends to encourage me when I meet with failure.
B I like to be successful in things undertaken.

79 A I like to be one of the leaders in the organizations and groups to which I belong.
B I like to be able to do things better than other people can.

80 A When things go wrong for me, I feel that I am more to blame than anyone else.
B I like to solve puzzles and problems that other people have difficulty with.

81 A I like to do things for my friends.
B When planning something, I like to get suggestions from other people whose opinions I respect.

82 A I like to put myself in someone else's place and to imagine how I would feel in the same situation.
B I like to tell my superiors that they have done a good job on something, when I think they have.

83 A I like my friends to be sympathetic and understanding when I have problems.
B I like to accept the leadership of people I admire.

84 A When serving on a committee, I like to be appointed or elected chairman.
B When I am in a group, I like to accept the leadership of someone else in deciding what the group is going to do.

85 A If I do something that is wrong, I feel that I should be punished for it.
B I like to conform to custom and to avoid doing things that people I respect might consider unconventional.

86 A I like to share things with my friends.
B I like to make a plan before starting in to do something difficult.

87 A I like to understand how my friends feel about various problems they have to face.
B If I have to take a trip, I like to have things planned in advance.

88 A I like my friends to treat me kindly.
B I like to have my work organized and planned before beginning it.

89 A I like to be regarded by others as a leader.
B I like to keep my letters, bills, and other papers neatly arranged and filed according to some system.

90 A I feel that the pain and misery that I have suffered has done me more good than harm.
B I like to have my life so arranged that it runs smoothly and without much change in my plans.

91 A I like to have strong attachments with my friends.
B I like to say things that are regarded as witty and clever by other people.

92 A I like to think about the personalities of my friends and to try to figure out what makes them as they are.
B I sometimes like to do things just to see what effect it will have on others.

93 A I like my friends to make a fuss over me when I am hurt or sick.
B I like to talk about my achievements.

94 A I like to tell other people how to do their jobs.
B I like to be the center of attention in a group.

95 A I feel timid in the presence of other people I regard as my superiors.
B I like to use words which other people often do not know the meaning of.

96 A I like to do things with my friends rather than by myself.
B I like to say what I think about things.

97 A I like to study and to analyze the behavior of others.
B I like to do things that other people regard as unconventional.

98 A I like my friends to feel sorry for me when I am sick.
B I like to avoid situations where I am expected to do things in a conventional way.

99 A I like to supervise and to direct the actions of other people whenever I can.
B I like to do things in my own way without regard to what others may think.

100 A I feel that I am inferior to others in most respects.
B I like to avoid responsibilities and obligations.

101 A I like to be successful in things undertaken.
B I like to form new friendships.

102 A I like to analyze my own motives and feelings.
B I like to make as many friends as I can.

103 A I like my friends to help me when I am in trouble.
B I like to do things for my friends.

104 A I like to argue for my point of view when it is attacked by others.
B I like to write letters to my friends.

105 A I feel guilty whenever I have done something I know is wrong.
B I like to have strong attachments with my friends.

106 A I like to share things with my friends.
B I like to analyze my own motives and feelings.

107 A I like to accept the leadership of people I admire.
B I like to understand how my friends feel about various problems they have to face.

108 A I like my friends to do many small favors for me cheerfully.
B I like to judge people by why they do something—not by what they actually do.

109 A When with a group of people, I like to make the decisions about what we are going to do.
B I like to predict how my friends will act in various situations.

110 A I feel better when I give in and avoid a fight, than I would if I tried to have my own way.
B I like to analyze the feelings and motives of others.

111 A I like to form new friendships.
B I like my friends to help me when I am in trouble.

112 A I like to judge people by why they do something—not by what they actually do.
B I like my friends to show a great deal of affection toward me.

113 A I like to have my life so arranged that it runs smoothly and without much change in my plans.
B I like my friends to feel sorry for me when I am sick.

114 A I like to be called upon to settle arguments and disputes between others.
B I like my friends to do many small favors for me cheerfully.

115 A I feel that I should confess the things that I have done that I regard as wrong.
B I like my friends to sympathize with me and to cheer me up when I am depressed.

116 A I like to do things with my friends rather than by myself.
B I like to argue for my point of view when it is attacked by others.

117 A I like to think about the personalities of my friends and to try to figure out what makes them as they are.
B I like to be able to persuade and influence others to do what I want to do.

118 A I like my friends to sympathize with me and to cheer me up when I am depressed.
B When with a group of people, I like to make the decisions about what we are going to do.

119 A I like to ask questions which I know no one will be able to answer.
B I like to tell other people how to do their jobs.

120 A I feel timid in the presence of other people I regard as my superiors.
B I like to supervise and to direct the actions of other people whenever I can.

121 A I like to participate in groups in which the members have warm and friendly feelings toward one another.
B I feel guilty whenever I have done something I know is wrong.

122 A I like to analyze the feelings and motives of others.
B I feel depressed by my own inability to handle various situations.

123 A I like my friends to feel sorry for me when I am sick.
B I feel better when I give in and avoid a fight, than I would if I tried to have my own way.

124 A I like to be able to persuade and influence others to do what I want.
B I feel depressed by my own inability to handle various situations.

125 A I like to criticize people who are in a position of authority.
B I feel timid in the presence of other people I regard as my superiors.

126 A I like to participate in groups in which the members have warm and friendly feelings toward one another.
B I like to help my friends when they are in trouble.

127 A I like to analyze my own motives and feelings.
B I like to sympathize with my friends when they are hurt or sick.

128 A I like my friends to help me when I am in trouble.
B I like to treat other people with kindness and sympathy.

129 A I like to be one of the leaders in the organizations and groups to which I belong.
B I like to sympathize with my friends when they are hurt or sick.

130 A I feel that the pain and misery that I have suffered has done me more good than harm.
B I like to show a great deal of affection toward my friends.

131 A I like to do things with my friends rather than by myself.
B I like to experiment and to try new things.

132 A I like to think about the personalities of my friends and to try to figure out what makes them as they are.
B I like to try new and different jobs—rather than to continue doing the same old things.

133 A I like my friends to be sympathetic and understanding when I have problems.
B I like to meet new people.

134 A I like to argue for my point of view when it is attacked by others.
B I like to experience novelty and change in my daily routine.

135 A I feel better when I give in and avoid a fight, than I would if I tried to have my own way.
B I like to move about the country and to live in different places.

136 A I like to do things for my friends.
B When I have some assignment to do, I like to start in and keep working on it until it is completed.

137 A I like to analyze the feelings and motives of others.
B I like to avoid being interrupted while at my work.

138 A I like my friends to do many small favors for me cheerfully.
B I like to stay up late working in order to get a job done.

139 A I like to be regarded by others as a leader.
B I like to put in long hours of work without being distracted.

140 A If I do something that is wrong, I feel that I should be punished for it.
B I like to stick at a job or problem even when it may seem as if I am not getting anywhere with it.

141 A I like to be loyal to my friends.
B I like to go out with attractive persons of the opposite sex.

142 A I like to predict how my friends will act in various situations.
B I like to participate in discussions about sex and sexual activities.

143 A I like my friends to show a great deal of affection toward me.
B I like to become sexually excited.

144 A When with a group of people, I like to make the decisions about what we are going to do.
B I like to engage in social activities with persons of the opposite sex.

145 A I feel depressed by my own inability to handle various situations.
B I like to read books and plays in which sex plays a major part.

146 A I like to write letters to my friends.
B I like to read newspaper accounts of murders and other forms of violence.

147 A I like to predict how my friends will act in various situations.
B I like to attack points of view that are contrary to mine.

148 A I like my friends to make a fuss over me when I am hurt or sick.
B I feel like blaming others when things go wrong for me.

149 A I like to tell other people how to do their jobs.
B I feel like getting revenge when someone has insulted me.

150 A I feel that I am inferior to others in most respects.
B I feel like telling other people off when I disagree with them.

151 A I like to help my friends when they are in trouble.
B I like to do my very best in whatever I undertake.

152 A I like to travel and to see the country.
B I like to accomplish tasks that others recognize as requiring skill and effort.

153 A I like to work hard at any job I undertake.
B I would like to accomplish something of great significance.

154 A I like to go out with attractive persons of the opposite sex.
B I like to be successful in things undertaken.

155 A I like to read newspaper accounts of murders and other forms of violence.
B I would like to write a great novel or play.

156 A I like to do small favors for my friends.
B When planning something, I like to get suggestions from other people whose opinions I respect.

157 A I like to experience novelty and change in my daily routine.
B I like to tell my superiors that they have done a good job on something, when I think they have.

158 A I like to stay up late working in order to get a job done.
B I like to praise someone I admire.

159 A I like to become sexually excited.
B I like to accept the leadership of people I admire.

160 A I feel like getting revenge when someone has insulted me.
B When I am in a group, I like to accept the leadership of someone else in deciding what the group is going to do.

161 A I like to be generous with my friends.
B I like to make a plan before starting in to do something difficult.

162 A I like to meet new people.
B Any written work that I do I like to have precise, neat, and well organized.

163 A I like to finish any job or task that I begin.
B I like to keep my things neat and orderly on my desk or workspace.

164 A I like to be regarded as physically attractive by those of the opposite sex.
B I like to plan and organize the details of any work that I have to undertake.

165 A I like to tell other people what I think of them.
B I like to have my meals organized and a definite time set aside for eating.

166 A I like to show a great deal of affection toward my friends.
B I like to say things that are regarded as witty and clever by other people.

167 A I like to try new and different jobs—rather than to continue doing the same old things.
B I sometimes like to do things just to see what effect it will have on others.

168 A I like to stick at a job or problem even when it may seem as if I am not getting anywhere with it.
B I like people to notice and to comment upon my appearance when I am out in public.

169 A I like to read books and plays in which sex plays a major part.
B I like to be the center of attention in a group.

170 A I feel like blaming others when things go wrong for me.
B I like to ask questions which I know no one will be able to answer.

171 A I like to sympathize with my friends when they are hurt or sick.
B I like to say what I think about things.

172 A I like to eat in new and strange restaurants.
B I like to do things that other people regard as unconventional.

173 A I like to complete a single job or task at a time before taking on others.
B I like to feel free to do what I want to do.

174 A I like to participate in discussions about sex and sexual activities.
B I like to do things in my own way without regard to what others may think.

175 A I get so angry that I feel like throwing and breaking things.
B I like to avoid responsibilities and obligations.

176 A I like to help my friends when they are in trouble.
B I like to be loyal to my friends.

177 A I like to do new and different things.
B I like to form new friendships.

178 A When I have some assignment to do, I like to start in and keep working on it until it is completed.
B I like to participate in groups in which the members have warm and friendly feelings toward one another.

179 A I like to go out with attractive persons of the opposite sex.
B I like to make as many friends as I can.

180 A I like to attack points of view that are contrary to mine.
B I like to write letters to my friends.

181 A I like to be generous with my friends.
B I like to observe how another individual feels in a given situation.

182 A I like to eat in new and strange restaurants.
B I like to put myself in someone else's place and to imagine how I would feel in the same situation.

183 A I like to stay up late working in order to get a job done.
B I like to understand how my friends feel about various problems they have to face.

184 A I like to become sexually excited.
B I like to study and to analyze the behavior of others.

185 A I feel like making fun of people who do things that I regard as stupid.
B I like to predict how my friends will act in various situations.

186 A I like to forgive my friends who may sometimes hurt me.
B I like my friends to encourage me when I meet with failure.

187 A I like to experiment and to try new things.
B I like my friends to be sympathetic and understanding when I have problems.

188 A I like to keep working at a puzzle or problem until it is solved.
B I like my friends to treat me kindly.

189 A I like to be regarded as physically attractive by those of the opposite sex.
B I like my friends to show a great deal of affection toward me.

190 A I feel like criticizing someone publicly if he deserves it.
B I like my friends to make a fuss over me when I am hurt or sick.

191 A I like to show a great deal of affection toward my friends.
B I like to be regarded by others as a leader.

192 A I like to try new and different jobs—rather than to continue doing the same old things.
B When serving on a committee, I like to be appointed or elected chairman.

193 A I like to finish any job or task that I begin.
B I like to be able to persuade and influence others to do what I want.

194 A I like to participate in discussions about sex and sexual activities.
B I like to be called upon to settle arguments and disputes between others.

195 A I get so angry that I feel like throwing and breaking things.
B I like to tell other people how to do their jobs.

196 A I like to show a great deal of affection toward my friends.
B When things go wrong for me, I feel that I am more to blame than anyone else.

197 A I like to move about the country and to live in different places.
B If I do something that is wrong, I feel that I should be punished for it.

198 A I like to stick at a job or problem even when it may seem as if I am not getting anywhere with it.
B I feel that the pain and misery that I have suffered has done me more good than harm.

199 A I like to read books and plays in which sex plays a major part.
B I feel that I should confess the things that I have done that I regard as wrong.

200 A I feel like blaming others when things go wrong for me.
B I feel that I am inferior to others in most respects.

201 A I like to do my very best in whatever I undertake.
B I like to help other people who are less fortunate than I am.

202 A I like to do new and different things.
B I like to treat other people with kindness and sympathy.

203 A When I have some assignment to do, I like to start in and keep working on it until it is completed.
B I like to help other people who are less fortunate than I am.

204 A I like to engage in social activities with persons of the opposite sex.
B I like to forgive my friends who may sometimes hurt me.

205 A I like to attack points of view that are contrary to mine.
B I like my friends to confide in me and to tell me their troubles.

206 A I like to treat other people with kindness and sympathy.
B I like to travel and to see the country.

207 A I like to conform to custom and to avoid doing things that people I respect might consider unconventional.
B I like to participate in new fads and fashions.

208 A I like to work hard at any job I undertake.
B I like to experience novelty and change in my daily routine.

209 A I like to kiss attractive persons of the opposite sex.
B I like to experiment and to try new things.

210 A I feel like telling other people off when I disagree with them.
B I like to participate in new fads and fashions.

211 A I like to help other people who are less fortunate than I am.
B I like to finish any job or task that I begin.

212 A I like to move about the country and to live in different places.
B I like to put in long hours of work without being distracted.

213 A If I have to take a trip, I like to have things planned in advance.
B I like to keep working at a puzzle or problem until it is solved.

214 A I like to be in love with someone of the opposite sex.
B I like to complete a single job or task before taking on others.

215 A I like to tell other people what I think of them.
B I like to avoid being interrupted while at my work.

216 A I like to do small favors for my friends.
B I like to engage in social activities with persons of the opposite sex.

217 A I like to meet new people.
B I like to kiss attractive persons of the opposite sex.

218 A I like to keep working at a puzzle or problem until it is solved.
B I like to be in love with someone of the opposite sex.

219 A I like to talk about my achievements.
B I like to listen to or to tell jokes in which sex plays a major part.

220 A I feel like making fun of people who do things that I regard as stupid.
B I like to listen to or to tell jokes in which sex plays a major part.

221 A I like my friends to confide in me and to tell me their troubles.
B I like to read newspaper accounts of murders and other forms of violence.

222 A I like to participate in new fads and fashions.
B I feel like criticizing someone publicly if he deserves it.

223 A I like to avoid being interrupted while at my work.
B I feel like telling other people off when I disagree with them.

224 A I like to listen to or to tell jokes in which sex plays a major part.
B I feel like getting revenge when someone has insulted me.

225 A I like to avoid responsibilities and obligations.
B I feel like making fun of people who do things that I regard as stupid.