

Impact of Personality Type on Group Learning in Pharmacy School

Stephanie Hunziker, PharmD and Remington Roy Pharm D Candidate

Background

- SIUE SOP uses team-based learning in nearly every classroom
- Minimal literature published address the ideal methods for creating student teams
- Previous studies used Clifton Strengths Finder and Basadur Problem Solving Profile
- Myers Briggs Personality Type Inventory (MBTI) is a 93-choice questionnaire that results in 16 different personality types
- P3 Skills Lab employs pairs of students for learning and exercises during the semester

Objectives

- Demonstrate the effectiveness of pairing students in pharmacy school with similar or different personality types based upon their MBTI code

Methods

Study Design:

- Descriptive study via survey

Study Sample:

- Included 61 P3 students who were in the fall and spring Skills Lab course

Group Formation:

- Students in the fall were placed in homozygous groups meaning they shared either the same traits or 3 of the same traits
- Spring semester was a mix of homozygous and heterozygous groups, heterozygous meaning completely different or sharing no more than 2 traits

Survey:

- Filled out 11 question survey in fall before and 17 question survey after fall or spring semester

Results from Pre/Post Survey

Questions in Number Order 1-11	Mean N=61	Agree	Slightly Agree	Neutral	Slightly Disagree	Disagree
I have taken a personality test such as the Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) and understand my results.	4.4	34	22	4	0	1
I enjoy working in groups for assignments/activities.	3.5	14	19	16	8	4
I like working in groups where I can pick who I am working with.	4.6	44	13	3	0	1
I usually choose to work with the same group of students on group assignments/activities.	4.8	50	8	3	0	0
I feel excluded when having to choose a group to work with in class.	2.3	3	8	13	15	22
My normal group I choose has similar personality traits as mine.	3.8	17	24	13	6	1
I interact and get along the best with others who have a similar personality to me.	4	24	18	14	5	0
I feel most comfortable working with those who have a similar personality to me.	4	25	16	16	3	1
I do not think grouping based on personality types contributes to how well we do on a group project.	2.9	9	9	19	15	9
I am typically satisfied with the grade I receive on work done within groups that I choose.	4.4	34	22	3	2	0
I am satisfied with the grade I receive on work done within groups that are chosen for me in the past.	3.5	18	16	11	12	4

This study challenged me to work with a student who had a different personality.	3.5	5	11	5	7	0
I enjoyed working with someone that was chosen for me.	3.2	5	7	7	6	3
I was satisfied with the grades I received over the course of the semester in this group.	3	8	3	4	7	6
I was satisfied with the amount of work I did in the group over the course of the semester in this group.	4	14	6	4	2	2
I was satisfied with the communication of the group over the course of the semester.	4.1	18	4	1	1	4
After this study, I would be more willing to be placed into groups based upon personality types.	3.9	16	3	4	1	4

Results

- 61 students in fall filled out pre-survey
- 28 students in the spring filled out the post-survey
- 92% of students slightly agreed or agree versus 44% slightly agree or neutral (4.4 vs 3.5 average) if satisfied with grade receive on pre-survey
- Mean values and rank distribution for the first 11 questions stayed the same (within 0.3 +/-)
- Students were neutral with the grade they received after the semester but six disagreed (21%) and seven slightly disagreed (25%)

Table 1 and 2: Fall And Spring

MBTI

Table 1: Student Population Breakdown and Group Formation Semester 1

Lab Section of P3 Students	Total Number of Students (n=61)		Types of groups formed from MBTI	
	# of Students Included	# of Students Excluded	Homozygous	Heterozygous
Section 1	18	1	9	0
Section 2	22	1	11	0
Section 3	10	1	5	0

Table 2: Student Population Breakdown and Group Formation Semester 2

Lab Section of P3 Students	Total Number of Students (n=61)		Types of groups formed from MBTI	
	# of Students Included	# of Students Excluded	Homozygous	Heterozygous
Section 1	18	1	6	3
Section 2	18	1	4	5
Section 3	14	1	1	6

E Extroverts
are energized by people, enjoy a variety of tasks, a quick pace, and are good at multitasking.

S Sensors
are realistic people who like to focus on the facts and details, and apply common sense and past experience to come up with practical solutions to problems.

I Introverts
often like working alone or in small groups, prefer a more deliberate pace, and like to focus on one task at a time.

N Intuitives
prefer to focus on possibilities and the big picture, easily see patterns, value innovation, and seek creative solutions to problems.

T Thinkers
tend to make decisions using logical analysis, objectively weigh pros and cons, and value honesty, consistency, and fairness.

J Judgers
tend to be organized and prepared, like to make and stick to plans, and are comfortable following most rules.

F Feelers
tend to be sensitive and cooperative, and decide based on their own personal values and how others will be affected by their actions.

P Perceivers
prefer to keep their options open, like to be able to act spontaneously, and like to be flexible with making plans.

Conclusion

- There was no positive or negative correlation between MBTI typing and influencing group formation in P3 Skills Lab
- Students are more open to being put into groups based upon personality groups
- Course instructors should judge carefully if this should be implicated into their classrooms
- More studies that include larger groups or more defined groups should be conducted before full conclusions should be made