

**PRF CROSS-CULTURAL PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDY OF LITHUANIAN STUDENTS,  
TEACHERS,  
AND SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS**

**Michael E. Illovsky**

*Western Illinois University*

**Grazina Gintiliene, &**

**Laima Bulotaite**

*Vilnius University*

**Jacqueline Rickman**

*Chicago Lighthouse, Chicago*

**Marijona Belekienė**

*Vilnius, Lithuania*

**Karl Janowitz**

*University City High School West Philadelphia*

*The Personality Research Form (PRF) was used to study the psychological traits of Lithuanian college of education students, teachers, and special education teachers. A sample of American college students was also used for comparison. Chi-square results indicated no statistical differences among the groups. Interpretations of the lack of significant results include: the PRF was unable to detect real differences; Lithuanian students, teachers, and special education teachers, and American college students are similar on the PRF scales. The authors discuss the value of psychologists, educators, and researchers testing their instruments on other cultures. Such studies can provide information into the robustness and validity of their instruments as well as offer insight into the learning and teaching process across cultures.*

The present study investigated the psychological traits of Lithuanian college of education students, teachers, and special education teachers. There is no literature on the use of the Personality Research Form (PRF) with Lithuanian college of education students, neither is there any with Lithuanian college students--nor with their teachers. However, there were studies using the PRF to study American college students. These studies include the following (some of these studies used other scales in addition to the PRF). Donovan & Bringmann (1983) found college undergraduates could accurately confirm their own personality test results on the PRF scales. Emmons & Diener (1984) studied college students with the PRF and the Eysenck Personality Inventory (along with self-ratings) and found that emotions had an impact on personality and that the judgment of the personality of others was based on their observed emotional reactions. Sage (1969) used the PRF to study college freshmen seeking counseling and compared them to psychiatric clients. The author found, compared to psychiatric clients, college males seeking counseling had higher scores on the Order scale and college females seeking counseling had higher scores on the Order and Cognitive Structure scales. Fowler (1985) used a five-factor, structural model of the Personality Research Form-E in a study of university undergraduates. The author found a very high level of similarity to other forms of the PRF, as well as to Jackson's (1999) scheme. Paunonen and Ashton (1998) studied the PRF and other popular psychological personality tests (California Psychological Inventory, the Comrey Personality Scales, the 16 Personality Factors Questionnaire, the Pavlovian Temperament Survey, and the Nonverbal Personality Questionnaire.) They found that each generally showed replicable factor structures across cultures; however, they also report that there was little data on the cross-cultural generality of the tests' criterion validities. Jackson (1999a) used the PRF to study American college of education students; however, the study used the PRF's Form A (the data in the present study was obtained using Form E). Data obtained using Form A presented too many problems for an accurate comparison with data obtained using Form E, e.g., Form A had 300 items, 15 scales, and score ranges of 00 to 20; Form E had 352 items, 22 scales, and score ranges of 00 to 16. Therefore, these data were not used for comparisons in the present

study.

The study of the psychological characteristics of college students and teachers can provide information on factors that facilitate, impede, and influence the learning and teaching process. Comparisons of teachers and students and comparisons with students from other cultures (in this case, Americans) can provide information on differences and similarities that might have an impact in the classroom. In addition, the use of a personality inventory (in this case the PRF) can provide information on its utility, strengths, and weaknesses when applied to another culture.

In this study, the participants were Lithuanian college students being educated to be teachers, and Lithuanian teachers and special education teachers working as teachers. These groups were studied to determine if there were psychological differences between them. The Personality Research Inventory (PRF) (Jackson, 1999) was used to study them.

### **Method**

The U.S. authors proposed this study, under the title of *Meeting the Needs of Teachers and Students*, at a presentation at the International Psychology Conference in Lithuania. Many of the participants were interested in the study, especially those from Lithuania and Russia. It was decided that Lithuania would be used as a prototype: It would be easier to conduct research in the smaller country of Lithuania than in Russia. The University of Vilnius is the main higher educational institution in Lithuania and they volunteered to conduct the research in their country.

The PRF was translated into Lithuanian (and Russian). Professors at the University of Vilnius asked students in their college education classes to fill the PRF questionnaire; teachers in Vilnius schools were informed of the study and volunteered to complete the questionnaire. Two sets of data were obtained: Each set of researchers surveyed their classes and surveyed teachers in their catchment areas. The students and teachers filled the PRF (Form E) and the results were gathered and sent to the participating faculty at the Vilnius University. The participating faculty members tabulated the data and emailed it to the researcher in the U.S. who then analyzed the data and wrote about the study. All the data that was sent are in Tables 1 and 2 of this study. The original raw data could not be obtained; therefore, more sophisticated data analysis was not generated.

### *Instrument*

The PRF has a long history, with extensive research, in a variety of settings. The PRF had its start with Henry Murray (1938). He and his colleagues at the Harvard Psychological Clinic endeavored to describe personality comprehensively. Douglas J. Jackson continued this line of work and first copyrighted the PRF manual in 1967. He wrote (Jackson, 1999) the PRF *...might be useful in personality research, and, secondly, to provide an instrument for measuring broadly relevant personality traits in settings such as schools and colleges, clinics and guidance centers, and in business and industry* (p. 1). The scales measure *personality traits broadly relevant to the functioning of individuals in a wide variety of situations* (Jackson, 1999, p. 1). The scales measure normal functioning rather than pathology. There are various forms of the PRF, e.g., Forms AA, G, and E. This study used Form E which has scores that range from 0 to 16. The inventory has a 6th grade reading level, takes 30-45 minutes to complete (it is untimed), consists of 352 questions answered as *True* or *False*.

The PRF consists of 22 scales. Brief descriptions of high scores on these scales are as follows (the reader is encouraged to look at the PRF manual for a complete description of the scales): *Abasement (Ab)*: shows self-effacing characteristics. *Achievement (Ac)*: aspires to do difficult tasks. *Affiliation (Af)*: enjoys being affiliate with people. *Aggression (Ag)*: is aggressive to others. *Autonomy (Au)*: likes to be independent and not committed to obligations. *Change (Ch)*: wants variety and change. *Cognitive Structure (CS)*: wants clarity--does not like ambiguity and uncertainly. *Defendence (De)*: defensive--defends self against real or imaginary enemies. *Dominance (Do)*: wants to have control and dominate. *Endurance (En)*: willing to work long and persevere. *Exhibition (Ex)*: prefers to be center of attention. *Harmavoidance (Ha)*: desires to avoid harm. *Impulsivity (Im)*: does things without first thinking them through. *Nurturance (Nu)*: values giving comfort and sympathy to others. *Order (Or)*: prefers to have order in their lives. *Play (Pl)*: likes to play and have a good time. *Sentience (Se)*: notices smells, sounds, sights, tastes, and feels. *Social Recognition (SR)*:

wants to be held in high esteem by others. *Succorance (Su)*: seeks comfort and reassurance. *Understanding (Un)*: need for knowledge and information. *Infrequency (In)*: this is a validity scale based on the plausibility of the responses; high scores can invalid the profile. *Desirability (Dy)*: degree to which the person describes self in a favorable manner.

## Results

**Table 1**  
**Demographics of Lithuanian Samples**

	Lithuanian data set 1			Lithuanian data set 2		
	Students	Teachers	Spec.Ed.	Students	Teachers	Spec.Ed <sup>a</sup>
Males	20	1	5	18	1	3
Females	36	50	54	26	47	47
Mean age	22.36	38.78	40.02	22.39	38.98	39.82
SD	2.42	8.66	10.34	2.7	8.78	10.76
Age range	21-38	23-57	23-70	21-38	23-57	23-70

<sup>a</sup>gender of three was unknown

Table 1 shows the demographics of Lithuanian samples. The Lithuanian samples consisted of two sets of data. The preponderance of the Lithuanian participants (students, teachers, and special education teachers) were females. All students were from Vilnius Pedagogical University, Lithuania.

For comparison, samples of American college students were also used in this study: the data were obtained from Table 1-4 of the PRF Manual (Jackson, 1999, p. 15). There were 1350 males and 1415 females in the American samples. According to the Manual these were randomly obtained from samples stratified by regions from 31 U.S. colleges; in addition, a sample of freshmen from Pennsylvania State University and two Canadian universities were added. The PRF Manual mentions the sampling techniques and statistical procedures used in the study but no mention was made on the age means, standard deviations, and ranges of the samples; therefore, age comparisons could not be made with the Lithuanian samples. Table 2 shows the study's data: the two sets of Lithuanian data, and the American college students' data. Table 3 shows the Chi square statistics calculated on the data.

The statistics were generated based on the midpoints of the means of each of the three groups in the Lithuanian data sets 1 and 2, and of the American male and female samples. For example, using Table 2, the midpoint of the Lithuanian students on the Abasement scale was 6.23: this was calculated from Lithuanian data set 1 students' Abasement score of 6.36, and Lithuanian data set 2 students' score of 6.09; similarly, midpoint calculations were derived from the means of American male and female students. There were 3076 students and teachers in the samples: 311 in the two Lithuanian samples, and 2765 in the American samples. Calculations were based on 21 scales: The Infrequency scale was not used in the calculations because it is a validity scale which has the purpose of determining how plausible the responses are; it is not designed to measure psychological characteristics. Results indicated no overall statistical significance:  $\chi^2(60, N = 3076) = 7.16, p = 1.0$ .

**Table 2**  
**Means and Standard Deviations of PRF Scores of Two Sets of Data of Lithuanian Students, Teachers, and Special Education Teachers, and of American College Students**

	Lithuanian data set 1						Lithuanian data set 2						American students			
	Students		Teachers		Spec.Ed		Students		Teachers		Spec.Ed		Males		Females	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Abasement	6.36	2.23	6.54	2.48	6.12	1.7	6.09	2.21	6.45	2.52	6.15	1.55	7.78	2.76	7.7	3.01
Achievement	8.25	2.33	8.59	2.15	8.15	3.06	8.32	2.48	8.56	2.05	8.17	3.15	10.98	3.12	10	3.41
Affiliation	9.85	2.61	9.1	2.67	8.05	3.1	9.81	2.63	9.89	2.64	8.04	3.19	8.33	3.7	8.9	4.03
Aggression	7.78	2.81	6.92	2.59	6.95	2.6	7.86	2.68	7.04	2.6	6.85	2.66	7.35	3.36	6.9	3.59
Autonomy	7.82	2.37	7.08	2.13	7.46	2.14	7.7	2.48	7.15	2.14	7.4	2.13	9.54	3.59	7.1	3.23
Change	9.07	2.79	7.67	2.57	8.25	2.38	9.35	2.68	7.56	2.56	8.26	2.39	9.49	2.86	9.9	3.09
Cognitive Structure	9.80	2.57	10.8	2.55	10.24	2.6	9.98	2.66	10.81	2.61	10.34	2.59	8.64	3.38	8.7	3.52
Defendence	8.14	2.62	8.61	2.99	8.37	2.78	8.11	2.81	8.58	3.07	8.4	2.9	5.75	3.53	6	3.48
Dominance	8.28	3.98	6.41	2.98	5.85	3.71	8.39	4.14	6.42	3	5.43	3.69	10.19	4.31	7.6	4.4
Endurance	8.48	2.85	8.18	2.52	8.22	2.97	8.41	2.98	8.35	2.44	8.17	3.02	10.92	3.11	10	3.33
Exhibition	8.56	3.85	7.24	3.91	6.31	3.89	8.43	4.01	6.94	3.83	6.38	3.99	7.52	4.16	7.2	4.76
Harmavoidance	9.61	4.04	12.8	3.02	12.03	3.41	9.66	4.25	12.67	3.07	12.04	3.44	7.41	4.03	9.5	4.43
Impulsivity	5.46	3.25	5.27	3.45	4.86	2.61	5.41	3.42	5.23	3.54	4.94	2.69	5.46	3.66	6.5	4.04
Nurturance	10.5	2.55	12	2.13	11.61	2.55	10.45	2.62	11.94	2.14	11.77	2.55	8.9	3.67	11	3.42
Order	9.79	3.58	9.69	3.24	8.8	3.36	9.8	3.61	9.73	3.31	9.06	3.2	7.82	4.73	8.2	4.52
Play	7.34	2.73	5.63	2.84	5.31	2.93	7.16	2.75	5.54	2.85	5.25	2.99	8.18	3.57	9	3.02
Sentience	9.25	2.15	8.96	2.55	9.36	2.45	9.14	2.31	9.04	2.6	9.53	2.44	9.27	3.63	11	2.75
Social recognition	8.46	2.58	8.98	2.48	8.05	2.49	8.66	2.64	8.94	2.53	8.15	2.49	7.52	3.75	8.2	3.68
Succurance	8.09	2.89	8.41	2.75	8.07	2.71	7.84	3.06	8.33	2.77	8.17	2.68	5.64	3.73	8.7	3.7
Understanding	7.75	2.86	9.2	2.83	9.49	2.56	7.8	3.1	9.25	2.87	9.58	2.45	10.25	3.26	9.7	3.49
Infrequency	1.61	1.9	0.82	0.9	0.84	0.98	0.8	0.76	0.73	2.52	.068	0.8	0.48	0.72	0.4	0.78
Desirability	9.22	2.08	9.67	2.63	10.12	2.7	9.4	2.12	9.67	2.57	10.13	2.77	10.78	3	11	2.53

**Table 3**  
**Observed and Expected Scores, and Chi-Squares of Lithuanian Students, Teachers, Special Education Teachers, and American Students**

			Lithuanian			Americans	$x^2$
			Students	Teachers	Spec. Ed.	Students	
Abasement		Obs	6.23	6.50	6.14	7.72	
		Ex	6.68	6.68	6.46	6.77	
		$x^2$	0.03	0.01	0.02	0.13	0.18
Achievement		Obs	8.29	8.58	8.16	10.49	
		Ex	8.92	8.93	8.63	9.04	
		$x^2$	0.04	0.01	0.03	0.23	0.32
Affiliation		Obs	9.83	9.50	8.05	8.63	
		Ex	9.05	9.05	8.75	9.17	
		$x^2$	0.07	0.02	0.06	0.03	0.18
Aggression		Obs	7.82	6.98	6.90	7.13	
		Ex	7.24	7.25	7.00	7.34	
		$x^2$	0.05	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.06
Autonomy		Obs	7.76	7.12	7.43	8.33	
		Ex	7.70	7.70	7.44	7.80	

		$x^2$	0.00	0.04	0.00		0.04	0.08
Change		Obs	9.21	7.62	8.26		9.68	
		Ex	8.73	8.74	8.45		8.85	
		$x^2$	0.03	0.14	0.00		0.08	0.25
Cognitive Structure		Obs	9.89	10.82	10.29		8.68	
		Ex	9.97	9.97	9.64		10.10	
		$x^2$	0.00	0.07	0.04		0.20	0.32
Defendence		Obs	8.13	8.60	8.39		5.90	
		Ex	7.79	7.80	7.53		7.90	
		$x^2$	0.01	0.08	0.10		0.50	0.70
Dominance		Obs	8.34	6.42	5.64		8.90	
		Ex	7.36	7.36	7.12		7.46	
		$x^2$	0.13	0.12	0.31		0.28	0.84
Endurance		Obs	8.45	8.27	8.20		10.56	
		Ex	8.91	8.92	8.62		9.03	
		$x^2$	0.02	0.05	0.02		0.26	0.35
Exhibition		Obs	8.50	7.09	6.35		7.38	
		Ex	7.37	7.37	7.12		7.46	
		$x^2$	0.17	0.01	0.08		0.00	0.27
Harmavoidance		Obs	9.64	12.71	12.04		8.45	
		Ex	10.76	10.77	10.41		10.90	
		$x^2$	0.12	0.35	0.26		0.55	1.28
Impulsivity		Obs	5.44	5.25	4.90		6.00	
		Ex	5.42	5.43	5.24		5.50	
		$x^2$	0.00	0.01	0.02		0.05	0.07
Nurturance		Obs	10.48	11.97	11.69		9.90	
		Ex	11.06	11.07	10.70		11.21	
		$x^2$	0.03	0.07	0.09		0.15	0.35
Order		Obs	9.80	9.71	8.93		7.99	
		Ex	9.15	9.16	8.85		9.27	
		$x^2$	0.05	0.03	0.00		0.18	0.26
Play		Obs	7.25	5.59	5.28		8.57	
		Ex	6.71	6.71	6.48		6.79	
		$x^2$	0.04	0.19	0.22		0.46	0.92
Sentience		Obs	9.20	9.00	9.45		10.02	
		Ex	9.46	9.47	9.15		9.59	
		$x^2$	0.01	0.02	0.01		0.02	0.06
Social Recognition		Obs	8.56	8.96	8.10		7.87	
		Ex	8.41	8.42	8.13		8.52	

		$\chi^2$	0.00	0.04	0.00		0.05	0.09
Succorance		Obs	7.97	8.37	8.12		7.17	
		Ex	7.95	7.95	7.68		8.05	
		$\chi^2$	0.00	0.02	0.02		0.10	0.14
Understanding		Obs	7.78	9.23	9.54		9.98	
		Ex	9.18	9.18	8.87		9.30	
		$\chi^2$	0.21	0.00	0.05		0.05	0.31
Desirability		Obs	9.31	9.67	10.13		10.88	
		Ex	10.05	10.05	9.71		10.18	
		$\chi^2$	0.05	0.01	0.02		0.05	0.13
							Total =	7.16
$\chi^2(60, N = 3076) = 7.16, p = 1.0.$								

### Discussion

This study is unique in that no similar comparative studies have been done with these populations. Further studies will be needed to help determine how representative the samples are and to which group they can be generalized to. It should be noted that the lack of statistical significance does not mean that there are no differences between the groups; rather, it implies that there are no differences as measured by the PRF. Also, there may have been significant statistical differences but the PRF was not able to delineate them because of the limitations of the inventory. As an inventory, this study did not provide any statistical data on the validity of its use across cultures. However, anecdotally, the terms, purpose, and use of the inventory appeared to be understood and well received by those who participated in the study.

Those involved in cross-cultural research are aware of the many difficulties endemic in cross-cultural work, e.g., there are problems of representative samples; definitions of culture and ethnicity; equivalence of questionnaires, terms, and concepts; development of measures to delineate cultural factors, and so on. Another problem that is more strident these days is that of dealing with the large amount of cross-cultural information that is available. With expediency of modern-day communications (the main modality by which the researchers communicated in this study was through e-mail) there is increasing collaboration on research; the following illustrate this point. In an article on teacher attitude toward students with disabilities in northeast Ohio, the authors (Cook, Cameron, and Tankersley, 2007) were from Hawaii, Norway, and the US. Kuyini and Desai (2007) were researchers from an Australian university, studying principals and teachers in Ghana, publishing their article in the United Kingdom. In a study of racial minorities and European Americans, the authors (Tenebaum and Ruck, 2007) were from the United Kingdom and New York. Woolfson, Grant, and Campbell (2007) were at Scottish universities studying students in Scotland. In a study of inclusion in Australia, the authors (Anderson, Klassen, and Georgiou, 2007) were from the United Kingdom and Canada. In such studies; it is difficult to gain an understanding of how the empirical data in one study relates to a study conducted in another country or culture. What is needed is a source that gathers, catalogs, and does an occasional meta-analysis of the data. Presently, two relevant sources that gather information are the Education Resources Information Center (ERIC) and the Human Relations Area Files (HRAF). ERIC gathers information in the field of education, however, it is difficult for the teacher and researcher to piece together information on how to teach and deal with students from various countries and cultures--this is not the function of ERIC. Cultural anthropology has taken a step in the direction in coordinating their diverse cultural research through the Human Relations Area Files, Inc. (2007). The HRAF has the purpose of serving as a central facility for comparative studies of human behavior, society, and culture. The teaching profession can benefit from drawing from this source more frequently, but the focus of HRAF is not on education, learning, and teaching. Another source of cross-cultural teaching information can be obtained through journals. But the journals that focus on cross-cultural education present research that is uncoordinated and fragmented. The information in these journals should be periodically summarized and shared in the general education journals. The general education journals can benefit from such activity because education is dealing with students and teachers from diverse cultures,

religions, languages, ethics, educational experiences, and so on. The teaching profession can benefit by having a central source that accumulates, catalogs, and shows patterns in cross-cultural teaching.

In regard to assessment, it would behoove psychologists, educators, and researchers to test their instruments in other cultures. Such studies can enable us to study the robustness and applicability of the instruments and can provide insights into students and teachers throughout the world. Cross-cultural studies can provide opportunities to learn new and different concepts and approaches to examining students and teachers. Cross-cultural studies provide insight not only into the teaching and learning of domestic groups but they can also provide helpful information when people cross borders and enter the education system: The United Nations (McBrien, 2005), and researchers (Portes and Zhou, 1993) have suggested the need to consider the diverse entry situations of immigrants and refugees and consider the needs and obstacles to education. Obtaining information on the psychological characteristics of students from other countries and cultures can help the teacher better understand and teach them.

#### *Acknowledgements*

Our sincere thanks to our colleagues at the University of Vilnius, and the Ministry of Education and Science of Republic of Lithuania. This study was made possible only because of the competence and efficiency of the research teams at the University of Vilnius. They translated the PRF (Form E) into Lithuanian (and Russian) and conducted the research. Our sincere thanks also to two students: Leva Salialionyte and Jolanta Bubniene from the Department of General and Educational Psychology of Vilnius University who collected part of the data from teachers. We are grateful for the statistical guidance of Adee Athiyaman, Ph.D. of the Illinois Institute for Rural Affairs (Macomb, Illinois).

#### **References**

- Anderson, C. J. K., Klassen, R. M., & Georgiou, G. K. (2007). Inclusion in Australia: What teachers say they need and what school psychologists can offer. *School Psychology International*, 28 (2), pp. 131-147.
- Cook, B. G., Cameron, D. L., & Tankersley, M. (2007, Winter). Inclusive teachers' attitudinal ratings of their students with disabilities. *The Journal of Special Education*, 40 (4), pp. 230-238.
- Donovan, J. P. & Bringmann, W. G. (1983, April). Confirming personality test results in the classroom. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 56 (2), 583-89.
- Emmons, R. A. & Diener, E. (1984). *An interactional approach to the study of personality and emotion*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 250619).
- Fowler, P. C. (1985, May). Factor structure of the Personality Research Form-E: A maximum likelihood analysis. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 41 (3), 377-81.
- Human relations area files*. Retrieved June 24, 2007, from Yale University web site: <http://www.yale.edu/hraf/about.HTM>.
- Jackson, D. N. (1999). *Personality research form manual*. Sigma Assessment Systems. Port Huron, MI
- Jackson, D. N. (1999a). *Personality research form manual*, Sigma Assessment Systems. Port Huron, MI.
- Kuyini, A. B., & Desai, I. (2007, June). Principals' and teachers' attitudes and knowledge of inclusive education as predictors of effective teaching practices in Ghana. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 7 (2), pp. 104-113.
- McBrien, J. L. (2005, Fall). Educational needs and barriers for refugee students in the United States: A Review of the Literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 75 (3), 329-364.
- Murray, H. A. (1938). *Explorations in personality*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Paunonen, S. V., & Ashton, M. C. (1998, January). The structured assessment of personality across cultures. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 29 (1), 150-170.
- Portes, A., & Zhou, M. (1993). The new second generation: Segmented assimilation and its variants. *The ANNALS of the Academy of Political and Social Science*, 530 (November), 74-96.
- Sage, E. H. (1969). *Manifest needs of freshmen who later use psychological services*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 033413).
- Tenenbaum, H. R., & Ruck, M. D. (2007, May). Are teachers' expectations different for racial minority than for European American students? A meta-analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99 (2), pp. 253-273.
- Woolfson, L., Grant, E., & Campbell, L. (2007, April). A comparison of special, general and support teachers' controllability and stability attributions for children's difficulties in learning. *Educational Psychology*, 27 (2), pp. 295-306.