This study investigated how the Achieving Styles Inventory (ASI) can be useful to teacher educators and students. According to this model, there are nine achieving styles divided into three domains--direct, instrumental, and relationship--each distinguished by a preferred means of achieving goals. The ASI is a 45-item self-report instrument that measures the extent of a person's preference for each style. The 152 graduate students (49 male and 103 female) who participated in the study were drawn from a graduate preservice teacher preparation program designed to appeal to career changers. Study findings revealed that education students had significantly lower scores for the Competitive Direct, Power Direct, Personnel Instrumental, Social Instrumental, and Collaborative Relational styles than did the norming population. There was also a difference by sex within the studied group, indicating that women were significantly less inclined to prefer the Competitive Direct, Power Direct or Social Instrumental styles than male students. Implications from this study for teacher education suggest further research in the use of the Achieving Styles model as a framework for self-reflective practice, appreciating student diversity, creating or adapting learning environment, and developmental instruction to enhance styles most desired for classroom practice. (Contains 22 references.) (ND)
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Abstract

A descriptive study of the achieving styles preferences of graduate teacher education students in an urban preservice program used the Achieving Styles Inventory (Lipman-Blumen & Leavitt, 1985), which students completed during scheduled classes. Significant findings at an alpha level of .01 showed that education students had significantly lower scores for the Competitive Direct, Power Direct, Personal Instrumental, Social Instrumental, and Collaborative Relational styles than did the norming population. There was also a difference by sex within the studied group, indicating that women were significantly less inclined to prefer the Competitive Direct, Power Direct or Social Instrumental styles than male students in the sample. A small group of students were individually interviewed. These students discussed their achieving styles preferences based on the ASI results presented in a graphical profile. All interviewed students welcomed and verified the information from their profiles, and discussed applying the self-knowledge gained through the achieving styles framework to their intended practice. Implications from this study in respect to teacher education are for further research in the use of the Achieving Styles model as a framework for self-reflective practice, for appreciating student diversity, for creating or adapting learning environments, and for developmental instruction to support or enhance styles most desired for classroom practice. Further research in the use of Achieving Styles as a leadership development tool is also recommended.
Achieving Styles Preferences of Education Students in a Graduate Teacher Preparation Program

Today, in response to criticism of public schools from the media and widespread attention to education's failures in teaching the basic literacies of reading, writing and critical thinking, many teacher education institutions seek to improve standards of teacher preparation. Educational reform movements endorse learner-centered instruction and authentic or performance assessments. Much of the recent research in pedagogy has stressed the benefits of collaborative learning techniques, cooperative projects and authentic tasks as means of improving pupil learning and of responding to the diversity of students (Sharan, 1980; Johnson, Johnson & Holubec, 1988). Attention to the concept of learning styles has also resulted in changes to curriculum (McCarthy, 1990; Kolb, 1984). This shift to a student-centered approach to learning operates on the assumption that a teacher assumes the role of facilitator to a greater degree than in the traditional teacher-centered classroom.

New conceptions of teaching as a collaborative activity for professional teachers also result in a press for curricular changes in teacher preparation. The influence of standards promulgated by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Preparation (NCATE) contribute to an emphasis by teacher educators on the importance of collaboration. Wise and Leibbrand (1996) discussed the NCATE PDS Standards Project: Preliminary Survey Findings, 1996, and quoted the report:

The 1990's view of teacher practice is moving toward teaching as collegial, that is, characterized by sharing, working in teams, observing peers, and studying with colleagues. . . Teaching would not have been described in this way just 20 years ago. The concept of a professional community is just beginning to have meaning in teaching and in teacher development. Practitioners in PDSs recently cited the
following shared beliefs: that teachers are learners, that teacher learning is collaborative, that teaching is engaging in continuous improvement, and that teachers are scholar/practitioners." (Trachtman, 1996)

The goal of this NCATE report and an organizational goal of NCATE is to reform education through the application of standards and accreditation to teacher preparation. The standards and performance appraisals designed to accomplish these goals will in turn require new attention to the characteristics of the prospective teachers trained in schools of education.

Also necessary to educational reform is teacher leadership. The teacher-proof curriculum has been repudiated. Fullan (1993) speaks of "change agentry" as an outgrowth of the moral purpose for teaching. Leadership qualities are in great demand where new educational innovations are being put into action. Yet, leadership development has not been attended to in similar dimensions in teaching as it has been in business. Traditional leadership qualities so often admired in business leaders, individualism, power and control, do not seem suited to the classroom teacher, even as the teacher becomes less central to, yet more responsible for, learning outcomes. "Connective leadership," (Lipman-Blumen, 1992) is a concept which could be useful when applied to teacher leadership. This conceptual framework is based on a model of human behavior described as Achieving Styles, (Lipman-Blumen, Handley-Isaksen & Leavitt, 1983) which describes how people go about accomplishing their goals (see Figure 1). Lipman-Blumen (1996) ties the concepts of connective leadership and achieving styles to the leadership qualities needed in an interdependent yet diverse world. As the profession of teaching is becoming more diverse and interdependent, this model has relevance for the educator. Avenues to leadership training and development such as connective leadership are needed to assist teachers in meeting the challenges posed by the new innovations in shared decision making and management of
Ideas of educational reform, including learner-centered instruction and assessment, teacher leadership, effectiveness, collaboration and professionalism are associated with teachers' personality characteristics and their fit with the environment of the schools. These ideas all impact on the preparation of new teachers. Historically, teacher education programs in the United States evolved to meet the labor market for teachers; now these same political and economic influences press the schools and teacher training institutions for expanded recruitment efforts. As part of the response to the need for a more capable and more diverse teacher population, especially in those critical areas required to compete in the global market, policy makers and higher education institutions have reached out to a broader population of students and/or allowed more options in access to teacher certification. A growing number of schools of education have devised graduate programs to reach non-traditional students who may be attracted to teaching as a career with greater potential for satisfaction than that offered by current career choices. Many of these programs make special effort to recruit minorities and women, and for specific subject-matter specialties (Bennett, 1991; Guyton et al, 1993; Powell, 1990; Powell & Riner, 1991; Zumwalt, 1991).

Serow and Forrest (1994) investigated the motives identified by adults changing careers to teaching, which were both idealistic and economic. These researchers cited Lortie's (1975) sociological study in which the concept of a "wide decision range" in which people can identify themselves as teachers anytime during their working years and "subjective warrant" where the candidates consider their personalities well matched to perceived teacher characteristics. MacDonald, Manning, and Gable (1994), reviewed characteristics of prospective teachers which
found that programs designed for career changers attract both recent college graduates and persons making career changes. More than one-third of applicants have previous teaching experience, and these certification programs attract older participants and more males than traditional teacher education programs. Admission criteria, beyond asking for high college grade point average, place emphasis on strong interpersonal communication skills and a firm commitment to teach.

The influence of previous experiences and current occupation may be strong for adults entering teaching from other careers. Powell and Riner (1991-2) investigated the influence of prior work and schooling experiences on career-change preservice teachers and found that the career-change students' planning and teaching were grounded in part in their former work experiences. This finding was attributed to the possibility that the educational models most contiguous with their current experiences were non-academic and focused on demonstrated productivity and outcome-based behavior. After six months in the teacher education program at which time students began student teaching, the researchers found that their former experiences were less influential in their school experiences. This effect was attributed to a restructuring of the preservice teachers' schemata from interactions in university coursework and with mentor teachers in field placements. As a result of this study, Powell and Riner (1991-2, p.14) recommended that,

teacher educators need to help preservice teachers closely examine their entry-level teaching biases, instructional strategies, and preconceptions of teaching, particularly preservice teachers entering teaching from other professions.
Purpose of the Study

As the programs serving non-traditional students who seek to begin a teaching career after substantial careers in other fields grow in size, the effects of the change in the population of entry level teachers will become apparent. Personality characteristics of pre-service teachers are of great importance for a teacher education program which must discharge the responsibility of certifying that a student is fit to practice with children. Academic criteria, such as undergraduate or graduate grade point average, achievement tests, interviews, recommendations and essays explaining the desire to teach are common candidate assessments. Standardized instruments or personality measures are not commonly used by either traditional or career change programs for teachers.

This study resulted from this investigator's curiosity about the graduate teacher education students, and the possibility of enhancing the teacher education program in order to develop teachers ready to meet the challenges of educational reform. A perceived need by faculty to better assess applicants and questions about additional screening devices were part of the motivation to engage in this study. For the program in this study, as with many teacher education programs, entry criteria are heavily weighted toward previous academic performance, with additional attention to an essay and to recommendations. A test of English competency (TOEFL) is required of foreign students. However, before discussion of admission criteria, one needed to describe the attributes of the current student body, largely composed of adults attempting to change their careers. This research used the theoretical framework of achieving styles preferences to describe a group of preservice teachers in an urban graduate teacher preparation program. The information derived from the study offers a profile of the current student body through the lens of
achieving styles. Implications about how this information can provide useful and formative knowledge to teachers and teacher educators are derived from the study's results.

The Achieving Styles Model, as developed by J. Lipman-Blumen and associates from the 1970's to the present, was the theoretical framework used in this study. This model and the instrument which explores achieving styles are currently being used as leadership development tools by human resource management professionals. Achieving styles are defined as the preferred strategies a person uses to accomplish tasks, which are developed in early life and honed through adulthood, and which are evident in behavior. The theory presupposes that individuals prefer certain styles with which they have previously been successful, and may combine those styles or adapt new styles to achieve goals in new situations. The Achieving Styles model identifies nine different achieving styles separated into three domains, direct, instrumental, and relational. (see Figure 2). Within the Direct Domain are the Intrinsic Direct, Competitive Direct, and Power Direct styles. The Instrumental Domain contains the Personal Instrumental, Social Instrumental, and Entrusting Instrumental styles. The Relational Domain contains the Collaborative Relational, Contributory Relational and Vicarious Relational styles. The instrument which measures preferences for each style is the Achieving Styles Inventory (ASI), (Lipman-Blumen & Leavitt, 1985), which is a forty-five item self-report questionnaire and an attached demographic form. The ASI uses a seven point scale ranging from never to always in response to statements of achieving preferences. The developers of this instrument provide validity and reliability data which support the model as an accurate representation of the characteristic preferences used by people attempting to achieve goals.

In terms of achieving styles, classroom teaching is composed of the combination or serial...
use of many, if not all, achieving styles. Facilitation of the type necessary to implement learner-centered instruction requires less emphasis of direct styles, with preferences for more instrumental and relational approaches in the classroom and with colleagues. It would therefore make sense if the teacher candidates in the education program would be inclined to facilitate learning, as shown through profiles of achieving styles preferences which favor instrumental and relational styles. However, if teacher education students, especially those who are leaving previous careers in business, rely primarily on direct achieving styles, adoption of the facilitating styles of pedagogy and student-centered collaborative learning techniques recommended by current educational research may be especially difficult. Adjustments in the teacher education course program specifically for second career business people could provide these students greater support in adapting to instrumental and relational teaching methods. Course content, sequence, and learning activities could be created or revised to provide support for direct achievers as they make the transition to the more instrumental and relational roles of classroom teacher and leader in a collaborative school.

According to Fullan (1993), "... teachers are agents of educational change and societal improvement." (p.11). Fullan further states that to be change agents, teachers need to develop personal vision, inquiry, mastery and collaboration. Fullan's "core capabilities" require personal self-examination. The self-knowledge gained from examining one's achieving styles profile, for an education student, especially when the student is changing careers, can serve as an impetus to self-reflection, which teacher educators can associate with Fullan's core capabilities. When a teacher's profile is linked with classroom practice, the achieving styles framework can become a powerful theoretical tool for analyzing teaching effectiveness.
The importance of this study relates in part to application of a business tool used by human resource development professionals to education. Attention to a personality framework such as achieving styles can provide a new means of responding programmatically to student diversity, especially in view of the numbers of second-career students now entering teaching. The conceptual achieving styles framework in general, and individual achieving styles profiles of specific students can provide teacher education faculty opportunities to more effectively select students, and to structure the curriculum and educational experiences through which preservice teachers learn about professional practice. Knowledge of students' achieving styles can serve teacher educators in structuring programs that afford opportunities to more closely match course sequence, content and teaching techniques to preferred styles, and attend to the development and enhancement of those less preferred styles deemed beneficial to classroom practice. Development of strategies for enhancing cue sensitivity and range of achieving styles would be an appropriate response to this knowledge and could become part of the explicit enactment of the mission or goals of teacher education programs.

Method

The Master of Science in Teaching (MST) program in this study was designed for part-time graduate students who have no previous formal study in the field of education. It appeals to adults who have decided to leave previously established careers and enter the teaching profession. It is not an alternative to traditional certification; its coursework conforms to state legislation regulating certification. Most courses meet in the evening or on weekends, and other non-traditional scheduling options are under consideration or in current use. The masters degree requires 36 credits of coursework, including five core courses which emphasize language,
meaning, critical thinking, global perspectives and research. Additional courses include methods
of teaching in subject areas and reading, and the student teaching practicum. Faculty have
expended energy in tailoring course curricula to provide content knowledge relevant to the
students' needs and developmental capabilities.

The goals of the program include:

... components which enable students to: (a) obtain a theoretical framework within
which to view the various domains of teaching: societal, institutional, instructional,
and personal/experiential; (b) develop creative and critical thinking skills in order to
reflect on their own knowledge and action to enable pupils to analyze and construct
meaning when engaging the school curriculum; (c) pursue field experiences so that
relationships are examined in theory and in practice; (d) employ research and
evaluative techniques in order to survey the literature, conduct investigations and
assess educational programs; and (e) become participants in problem-solving and
decision making processes which enhance their opportunities to emerge as effective
teachers and leaders in school environments. (Pace University, 1995, p.26)

Entry criteria for matriculation in the program are a baccalaureate degree from an
accredited institution, a personal statement of interest in teaching, and two letters of reference. A
2.75 (of 4.0) grade point average in the subject area for which certification is sought is preferred.
An interview with a faculty member may be required where the previous academic record is
questionable. No testing other than the TOEFL for foreign students to certify ability in English, is
required.

In order to conduct this study, permission to use the ASI was obtained from the
Achieving Styles Institute, and the School of Education Dean, department chairs, and faculty
were apprised of the nature of the research. Each faculty member was asked to allocate a 30
minute portion of a class period to administer the questionnaire in a standardized manner.

Students in the MST program participated in this study as an intact group during Spring 1995
scheduled classes by completing the Achieving Styles Inventory (Lipman-Blumen & Leavitt, 1985) and the demographic questionnaire which accompanies it. Of a total student body of 196 students, 152 students on both campuses gave consent to participate in the study and completed the ASI survey and demographic information. The ASI was scored and reported by the Achieving Styles Institute.

Interviews provided a qualitative method of exploring and supplementing the survey data with personal detail. Students were selected for interviews based on two criteria: first, whether they represented "second career" seekers, a group of interest to this researcher, or second, whether the scores on the ASI represented group "peaks," the most extreme high scores. The rationale for the selection of peak scores was that meeting students who had scored at the upper extreme of a style represented a way of finding the strongest expression of that style in real life.

The interview protocol was semi-structured as a response to receiving one's personal profile results. At the beginning of the interview the student was given the original graphical profile representing his/her results on the ASI and a sheet which explained each style. The student was given time to read the sheet and review the profile graphic. The interview proceeded with questions which asked the student to verify the accuracy of the profile or disagree with the results, and to offer personal interpretations of the profile, including remembering incidents where achieving styles preferences became apparent. Questions about the usefulness of the knowledge to teaching practice provided indication of the extent of formative knowledge for preparatory teachers.

Results

Statistics to analyze the ASI data were selected with the following goals in mind: (a) to
gain descriptive information about the population, and (b) to provide a gauge of the usefulness of this particular theoretical framework applied to teacher education. The statistical procedures included: (a) statistical summarization with frequency and means, (b) comparison of means for the individual styles between the subject population and reported norms for the instrument with a One-Sample t-test at an alpha level of .01 and (c) comparison by gender within the sample.

The frequency data relevant to this study comes from the demographic questionnaire included with the ASI. Each campus contributed roughly half of the participants in this study. The response rate was 77.6%, or roughly three quarters of the students in the program. The response rate for the New York campus (82.7%) was slightly higher than for the Westchester campus (72.8%), which had a larger student body. The high overall response rate was primarily due to the cooperation of the faculty, particularly the New York faculty, who administered the survey during their classes, between midterm and the end of the Spring 1995 semester.

Other frequency data which contributes to understanding the results of this study comes from the demographic questionnaire. Sex and age distributions of the sample show a student group roughly two thirds female (49 male / 103 female). The largest number of students were in their twenties (74) and thirties (46), but older students were well represented with 21 students in their forties and five in their fifties. The race/ethnicity of the sample was approximately 80% white and 10% African American, with all other ethnicities accounting for the remaining 10%.

Comparisons with Achieving Styles Norm Data

Norms for the Achieving Styles Inventory have been established for age, citizenship, gender, marital status, educational level, type of employer and various occupations (not including teaching). The norming data comes from 3165 cases collected from various settings, mostly from
A comparison of age and years of education between the norming group and the MST students in Table 1 shows that MST students are slightly younger and have reached similar educational levels to the norming population. The smaller standard deviation for the MST groups shows a smaller variance in range for both age and education for the graduate students than was in the norm group. However, these rough demographic similarities between the norm group and the education students make the following comparisons of stylistic preferences reasonable.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Age</th>
<th>Std Dev for Age</th>
<th>Mean Years of Education</th>
<th>Std Dev for Years of Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norm All (N=3165)</td>
<td>36.30</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>17.04</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm Males (N=1239)</td>
<td>37.39</td>
<td>12.04</td>
<td>17.53</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm Females (N=1913)</td>
<td>35.55</td>
<td>12.36</td>
<td>16.72</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MST All (N=146)</td>
<td>31.85</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>17.30 (N=145)</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MST Males (N=49)</td>
<td>33.02</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>17.58</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MST Females (N=103)</td>
<td>31.29</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>17.16</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To compare the results of the MST students to the reported norms for each Achieving style, One-Sample t-tests were performed. Tables A1, A2, and A3 (Appendix) display the results of these t-tests for males, females and all students, respectively. The data for all the students
showing profiles which are fairly well rounded with scores above four on the one to seven scale, with the exception of Social Instrumental and Competitive Direct. Intrinsic Direct was the highest overall score for the total norming group as well as for each sex in the norm group. This was also true for the MST student population, although both male and female MST students had lower mean scores on this style than the norm group. For both sexes of the norming group, Power Direct ranked second highest. For the MST students, males ranked Contributory Relational second and Power Direct third, while female MST students ranked Vicarious Relational second and Contributory Relational third, Entrusting Instrumental fourth, Collaborative Relational fifth, Power Direct sixth, and Personal Instrumental seventh. As was true for the norm group, MST students of both genders ranked Competitive Direct styles just above last. The lowest scoring achieving style for both the norming group and for the MST students was Social Instrumental. Significant differences between the female norm group and the female MST students were found for Competitive Direct, Power Direct, Personal Instrumental, Social Instrumental, and Collaborative Relational styles. This was not true for male MST students in comparison with the male norm except for Power Direct.
Comparison of Achieving Styles for Male and Female Students

Independent Samples t-tests were performed for each style to compare the mean scores of male and female MST students. Table A4 displays these values, with a significant difference for the Competitive Direct style, where women had significantly lower scores than men. No other styles showed significant gender differences within the education student group.

Interviews

The purpose of the interviews was to supplement and elaborate on the ASI data, and make the ASI results meaningful in terms of usability in teacher education. Interviews explored how the application of the conceptual framework of achieving styles could motivate self-reflection by the students. Interview data suggested that education students find the achieving styles framework meaningful. Each student interviewed was given a copy of his or her personal results on the ASI in the form of a polar graph and an accompanying page which described each of the styles. The student's results were discussed and interpreted. The interviewees were first asked to express their thoughts about the veracity of their profiles, and to cite instances of how they enacted their styles, normally beginning with their peak styles. Students were then asked to project how they would adapt their stylistic preferences to the classroom environment. Although the qualitative portion of this study was not designed as a validity check of the instrument, and would not serve as such because of the limited sample size, the link was unmistakable. The students who were interviewed all expressed, in varying degrees, that the profile plot outcomes represented the ways they approach achievement.

All the interviewed students felt that the Achieving Styles polar graphs provided useful information for teaching practice. Students saw different uses for the self-knowledge. A male
student expressed the view that as a teacher, that now he would “... try to take into account that people have different achieving styles or learning styles ... (I can) look for different Achieving Styles in different domains (regarding pupils).”

A female second career student saw the usefulness of knowing her own achieving style preferences as a reaffirmation of her own self opinion. This student’s perception of the importance and usefulness of self knowledge was both from her experiences in the business world, and her opinion of what would be required of a teacher:

It helps in any practice to understand who you are about and what your style is, because how you’re going to interact with people depends on your style and you need to know that, so that when you meet opposite styles, et cetera that you understand what’s happened. I’ve had this kind of thing in leadership classes, and they’ve helped me with introspection and understanding. And it’s been very productive. So teachers should understand. We all need to know that for whatever we’re doing to understand how we interrelate in this world.

Another female second career student felt that the Achieving Style profile results might have been more useful to her earlier in her life, and wondered how her profile might change when she has experience as a classroom teacher.

Where I am, at this point in my life, I think it’s (the ASI result) pretty accurate. It would be interesting to see, after a few years in the classroom, how it changed? I’m sure it would. I guess, looking at it, I think, Gee, vicarious, social and entrusting are some things I’d like to have strength in in the classroom, and they’re the weaker ones on my list...

A younger female student who had no leadership training in her employment history, said,

It (the ASI) put the definition on how I do things, so I can understand why I’m doing it. So of course it would help, because once you know the why, then you figure out ... Once I know how I work at something, it also takes the shape of how others will relate to me.
A male student, who had a short career in government and who had group peak scores for Competitive Direct, explained how he believed he had come to prefer competitive situations. He then discussed how he planned to use this knowledge,

... when I entered the classroom I would have to make sure I'm not focussing so much on me. I'm not there to learn. It's them. I would do my best, to say OK, I know what I want to do, and what I want to accomplish, but at the same time I have to understand what my children want to accomplish, and make sure I'm not selfish. I'm there for them, and to sacrifice, and do what I have to do so they can accomplish what they're there to accomplish, their goals.

The interview data was revealing of the meanings that the students attached to the ASI profiles. Their interpretations and projections of use provided indications of self-reflection motivated by a conception of behavior based on achieving styles.

Discussion

This study investigated Achieving Styles of a specific group of urban graduate education students to describe the achieving styles they prefer and compare those to the norm group. Salient demographic aspects, including the proportion of males and females and educational level attained were similar in both the norming population and the sample, although the norm included many more subjects of varying backgrounds, with many business executives represented.

The achieving styles of the sample group were generally consistent with the expectations set by the norming population. These results are in accord with expected findings as described in the Achieving Styles Technical Handbook (Lipman-Blumen, 1988). Both the students and norming group preferred the Intrinsic Direct style as a first choice, most likely because the Intrinsic Direct style demonstrates the strong nature of American individualism. The lowest scoring achieving style for the norming group and for the MST students was Social Instrumental.
According to Lipman-Blumen, (1988), behaviors associated with the Social Instrumental style, which uses relationships as avenues to achievements, are considered as antithetical to the meritocratic values of American culture. An interesting but unanticipated phenomenon was that all the second career interviewees expressed antipathy towards what they called “political” requirements of their business careers. This distaste for politics was interpreted as supporting the low scores for the Social Instrumental style. Reflecting achieving styles preferences as well as subjective warrant, these students have assumed that a teaching career is more independent and less political than the business careers they intend to leave.

Significant differences (at an alpha level of .01, to avoid Type I error) were found between the students and the mostly business executives who formed the norming population. The education students as a group had lower mean scores for Competitive Direct, Power Direct, Personal Instrumental, Social Instrumental, and Collaborative Relational. In gender comparisons, there was a significantly lower preference for Power Direct styles by male students than for the norm values reported for males, although there were no other significant differences at the .01 level for males. Female students were more differentiated from the norming population than were the male students. Female students scored significantly lower than females in the norm group for Competitive Direct, Power Direct, Personal Instrumental, Social Instrumental and Collaborative Relational styles. Because so many styles produced significant differences between the female education students and the norm females, these results need further investigation. Whether these results can be attributed to differences in the employment histories of the teacher education students is questionable, because almost all of the teacher education students reported business employment histories. A significant difference between genders for the Competitive Direct style,
where women had significantly lower scores than men was the single most important stylistic difference within the student group. Female students were significantly less inclined to prefer competition than both the norm group of females and the male students. The Competitive Direct preference for males is consistent with expectations from the norming population attributed to Western societal preference for greater experiences with competition among males. In an educational setting, implications of the gender differences in preferences for competitive achieving styles by males are indicative of the need for self-awareness, as was noted in the interview data, where the male student interviewed recognized his need to compete and reminded himself that he needed to control his competitive preference in the classroom.

Limitations of these findings are primarily that this study is of a single sample drawn from one university. Data from other teacher education institutions could improve the impact of this study's delineation of differences from the norm group. The small sample of interviewees represents another major factor limiting the generalizability of the study. However, since the intent of the interviews was to explore the phenomenon of gaining self-knowledge about achieving styles rather than to independently indicate validity, the limitations of the interviews did not compromise the results of the instrument. Additionally, this study could be improved by more sophisticated data analyses, which remain to be accomplished.

In this study the achieving styles model was used as a tool to motivate self-reflective activity. The theory can serve as a catalyst for self-reflective knowledge and an analytical tool through which faculty and students can develop an appreciation for the range of possible achieving styles and diversity of preferences. Achieving styles theory can be applied to serve a number of useful purposes in teacher education. Some possible applications for achieving styles
Achieving Styles

and ASI information in teacher education could be as an applicant selection tool, or to suggest learning environments or instructional designs that would improve the preservice education delivered. Education students would recognize the benefits of a particular set of styles in an educational environment, for example the Relational and Instrumental sets in a classroom which rewards connective behaviors. Attention to achieving styles can guide faculty in developmental instruction toward assisting the preservice students to expand their range of styles to better suit the school environment. Developmental instruction, based on the understanding that characteristics of the learner and the learning environment have an impact on the quality of the learning, would lead to modifications in program content and structure. The teacher education program could facilitate students in conscious efforts toward developing range and flexibility with their less preferred styles. As identification of students’ preferred achieving styles could help teacher educators structure appropriate learning experiences and learning environments, these students would benefit from a program which enhanced their opportunities to use a range of appropriate styles. The concept of implementing an enhancement to teacher development is a generative act because education students will be the teachers of the next generation. As teachers they will create environments in their classrooms which reflect their achieving styles preferences. In turn, the classroom environment influences children's development, establishing preferences in the next generation.

For the particular teacher education program studied, the exploration of this framework and instrument has led to a number of conversations with faculty to explain the theoretical basis for the study, and offer insights about the results. These conversations have been useful to the faculty as they review and enhance the curriculum, and in exploring ways to select applicants and
retain students. Currently, a study of achieving styles as a framework which provides a useful lens for preservice teacher self-reflection is underway.

Further study of achieving styles in teacher education is warranted. Whether differences truly show that these students represent a unique population is not clear, and further analysis of the data and additional studies with expanded groups of teacher education students would be useful. The relationships which may exist between the various achieving styles and teacher effectiveness could provide much useful information to teacher educators and education policy makers. Studies which use the companion tool for the ASI, the Organizational Achieving Styles Inventory (OASI) (Lipman-Blumen, 1988) or observational methodology could provide this data. The assumptions by this researcher that preferences for relational and instrumental achieving styles would be better suited to an environment in a constructivist classroom where education was learner-centered, also remain to be studied.

Can teachers, both pre-service and in-service, use the achieving styles profile as a vehicle to motivate self-reflective behavior? Use of the ASI as an instigator of self-reflection was successful in the interview portion of this study and is part of a subsequent study by this author (in progress). Does the age or previous employment of the student make a difference in the usability of the ASI in teacher development? What research identifies effective ways to help develop teacher leadership? Is the concept of connective leadership congenial to a school setting? Can teachers and school administrators as well as teacher educators use the achieving styles profile as a vehicle for leadership development? These are some of the questions and research studies this topic and descriptive study have engendered. There is much to know about who the teachers of the next generation will be, and how best to prepare them to meet the challenge of a
connective world.

Just as Fullan (1993, p. 10) found in his study of post-baccalaureate education students, where the most commonly cited reason for becoming a teacher was, "I want to make a difference," the education students I interviewed want to teach in order to make a difference in children's lives. Each one of the interviewed students supported the idea that knowledge of achieving styles preferences contributed to self-knowledge. They made connections between achieving styles and teaching career aspirations. Hopefully, this study provides some impetus to use the achieving styles framework within teacher education.
Figure 1

L-BL Achieving Styles Model

# Achieving Styles

Table A1

Comparison of Achieving Style Means for Male MST Students with Norm Values for Males

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Norm value(Male)</th>
<th>Mean (Male)</th>
<th>Std Dev(Male)</th>
<th>Value of t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=1239</td>
<td>N=49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Direct</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Direct</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Direct</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>-3.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Instrumental</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>-2.47*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Instrumental</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>-1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrusting Instrumental</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Relational</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>-1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributory Relational</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicarious Relational</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. **p<.01

Range: 1(Never) - 7(Always)

*p<.05

Norms by Gender (1988, Lipman-Blumen, p.G-1). Entrusting Instrumental was Reliant Instrumental. Std. Dev. values not reported for Norm Styles. Mean and Std Dev values rounded to hundredths.
### Table A2

**Comparison of Achieving Style Means for Female MST Students with Norm Values for Females**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Norm value (Female)</th>
<th>Mean (Female)</th>
<th>Std Dev (Female)</th>
<th>Value of t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=1913</td>
<td>N=103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Direct</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>-2.51*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Direct</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>-5.31**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Direct</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>-6.69**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Instrumental</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>-2.81**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Instrumental</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>-6.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrusting Instrumental</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>-1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Relational</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>-2.68**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributory Relational</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicarious Relational</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.**  
**p<.01. *p<.05**  
Range: 1 (Never) - 7 (Always)

Norms by Gender (1988, Lipman-Blumen, p.G-1). Entrusting Instrumental was Reliant Instrumental. Std. Dev. values not reported for Norm Styles. Mean and Std Dev values rounded to hundredths.
### Table A3
Comparison of Achieving Styles for all MST students with Norm Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Norm Mean N=3165</th>
<th>Mean MST N=152</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Value of t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Direct</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>-2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Direct</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>-5.09**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Direct</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>-7.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Instrumental</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>-3.89**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Instrumental</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>-6.03**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrusting Instrumental</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>-1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Relational</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>-3.49**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributory Relational</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicarious Relational</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.**  
**p<.01, two-tailed.**  
Range: 1(Never) - 7(Always)  
Mean and Std Dev values rounded to hundredths.  
Entrusting Instrumental was Reliant Instrumental. Std Dev. Values not reported for Norm styles.
### Achieving Styles

Table A4

**T-test for Sex on ASI Scales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Mean (Male)</th>
<th>Std Dev (Male)</th>
<th>Mean (Female)</th>
<th>Std Dev (Female)</th>
<th>Value of t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Direct</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Direct</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>3.87**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Direct</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>2.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Instrumental</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Instrumental</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>2.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrusting Instrumental</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>-.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Relational</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributory Relational</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicarious Relational</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>-.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  
**p<.01, two-tailed.**  
*p<.05, two-tailed.**  
Range: 1(Never) - 7(Always)  
Mean and Std Dev values rounded to hundredths.
Figure 2

INDIVIDUAL ACHIEVING STYLES

DIRECT SET

These styles are characterized by activities which require direct confrontation with the task and entail personal efforts of mind and/or body to accomplish goals. Primary orientation: own task.

1. **Intrinsic.** One enjoys doing/mastering the task. Confronts the task directly and individually, pitting oneself against the task. Takes satisfaction from doing well and measures achievement against internalized standard of excellence, including own previous performance.

2. **Competitive.** One compares own performance to others' or rank orders own contribution to a task relative to others' contributions. Takes satisfaction from winning or outperforming others.

3. **Power.** One takes control and/or organizes other individuals, resources, tasks, and situations related to task accomplishment. Delegates tasks without relinquishing overall control and leadership. Takes satisfaction from being in charge.

INSTRUMENTAL SET

These styles are characterized by activities which require the use of personal characteristics and/or accomplishments, as well as relationships with others, as instruments to achieve still other goals. Primary orientation: system and informal group processes and human interaction.

4. **Personal.** One uses personal attributes and own accomplishments as pathways to further goals. Values personal achievements as instruments for gaining recognition, relationships, and/or other accomplishments. Negotiates, persuades, and uses symbolic gestures to dramatize goals. Takes satisfaction from public recognition of personal attributes and accomplishments.

5. **Social.** One uses relationships, as well as the informal system and/or group dynamics, as mechanisms for achieving goals. Targets and develops relationships as means toward other specific ends or accomplishments. Takes satisfaction from knowing and using large network of "contacts."

6. **Entrusting.** One entrusts others to assume partial or total responsibility for one's task. Controls goal selection, but not necessarily means. Perceives and treats everyone as potential helper. Takes satisfaction from accomplishing task with reliable others' help. Empowers others in the process.

RELATIONAL SET

These styles are characterized by activities which require contributing actively or passively to the tasks or goals of others. Collaborates, contributes, encourages, or simply nurtures relationships with other achiever(s) with whom one identifies and also admires. Takes pride in others' accomplishments. Primary orientation: others' tasks.

7. **Collaborative.** One identifies with and participates in team efforts to achieve goals. Expects appropriate share of rewards and responsibilities for group's accomplishments. Takes satisfaction from accomplishing tasks as part of team.

8. **Contributory.** One identifies with and contributes actively to others' tasks. Accepts goals defined by others and recognizes own contribution as helpful, but secondary, to others' achievements. Takes satisfaction from contributing to others' tasks.

9. **Vicarious.** One identifies with and/or contributes only indirectly to the accomplishments of other individuals/institutions. Advises or encourages others, or simply nurtures relationship with other achievers. Takes pride in and satisfaction from others' achievements as if they were one's own (1985, Lipman-Blumen).
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