



Personality of High School Students of Mehsana District

DR. NILESH B. GAJJAR

Assistant Professor,
S.V.S. Education College, (M.Ed.) P.G. Dept.,
Nagalpur, Mehsana, Gujarat (India)

DR. SURESH R. PARMAR

Assistant Professor,
Swami Vivekanand Sarvodaya Edu. College,
Nagalpur, Mehsana, Gujarat (India)

Abstract:

Personality is the particular combination of emotional, attitudinal, and behavioral response patterns of an individual. Different personality theorists present their own definitions of the word based on their theoretical positions. Psychologists such as Freud and Erickson have attempted to come up with personality theories. Personality type refers to the psychological classification of different types of individuals. Personality types are sometimes distinguished from personality traits, with the latter embodying a smaller grouping of behavioral tendencies. Types are sometimes said to involve qualitative differences between people, whereas traits might be construed as quantitative differences. According to type theories, for example, introverts and extraverts are two fundamentally different categories of people. According to trait theories, introversion and extraversion are part of a continuous dimension, with many people in the middle. The researchers want to know about the personality of the high school students of Mehsana District via this study.

Keywords: *High School students, Multidimensional Personality Inventory, Personality, Personality traits, Students*

1. Introduction

A society with domestic idea attempts consciously to improve its programme and agencies for serving the common welfare of all of the citizens of nation. It attempts to ensure those improvements chiefly by establishing educational institutions which socially acceptable interest and needs that youth feels may be citizen's responsibility. The educational system plays a very important role developing various kinds of personality traits, values and national feelings.

2. Review of Related Literature

Bhushan (1968) generalized factors were sustainably selected to the leadership and performance, Gupta (1975) found that age affected significantly the stratum factor of adjustment, Prabhavati (1978) found that male teachers secured better points in values, and most of the variables were found to be correlated, Chaube (1982) found that the girls studying in different faculties has almost the similar value patterns, all the students shows the minimum preference for the values, Chetnji (1983) found that the different faculty group significantly found higher, Sanehy(1989) found as regards to the value as compared to non-delinquents and Sharma(1986) found experience affect to the behavior of the person.

It is also conclude that different kind of the study has been conducted with reference to different kind of students of sample in relation to personality and values with different area.

3. Objectives of the Problem

1. To study the effects of different component of personality of students of secondary school of Mehsana District
2. To study the effects of gender with reference to personality of students of secondary school of Mehsana District
3. To study the effect of habitat with reference to personality of students of secondary school of Mehsana District
4. To study the effect of standard (8 and 9) with reference to personality of students of secondary school of Mehsana District

4. Hypotheses of the Study

- H₀₁** There will be no significant difference between mean score on Multidimensional Personality Inventory of different component of personality of secondary school of Mehsana District.
- H₀₂** There will be no significant difference between mean score on Multidimensional Personality Inventory of total male and total female students of secondary school of Mehsana District.
- H₀₃** There will be no significant difference between mean score on Multidimensional Personality Inventory of total urban and total rural students of secondary school of Mehsana District.
- H₀₄** There will be no significant difference between mean score on Multidimensional Personality Inventory of standard eight and standard nine students of secondary school of Mehsana District.

5. Definitions of the terms

“To define a problem means specify it in detail and with Precision.”

5.1 Personality

According to E.L. Thorndike “ Personality is one of the most abstract words in our language and like any abstract word suffering from excessive use, its connotative significance’s is very broad, its denotative significance is negligible. Hardly there is any modern term relating to the personality resemble one another in one-way or the other because they are derived from the same origin.

5.2 Multidimensional Personality Inventory

(By Km. Manju Agrawal) has been used for the age group of 13 to 26 years.

5.3 School

Educational institution for pupils up to 19 years of age or (US) is including college or university level.

5.4 High School Students

In this present research High School Students means Student, who are studying in standard-8 and standard-9?

6. Delimitation of the Study

The present study is delimited for the students (Standard-8 and Standard-9) of secondary schools of Mehsana District only, who are studying regularly during the year of the 2012-2013.

7. Tool used for the Study

For the present study selected tools (Multidimensional Personality Inventory (by Manju Agrawal) was applied for the study.

Table 1 Reliability of Multidimensional Inventory

Sr.No.	Component	Test-Retest	Split-half Reliability
1	Extroversion- Introversion	0.72	0.82
2	Self-concept	0.81	0.84
3	Dependence-Independence	0.69	0.78
4	Temperament	0.72	0.87
5	Adjustment	0.84	0.79
6	Anxiety	0.71	0.86
7	Multi Dimensional Inventory	0.74	0.74

8. Population and Sample

8.1 Population

For the present study all the students of standard-8 and standard-9, from the Mehsana District studying during the year of 2012-2013.

8.2 Sample

For the present study random sampling technique was used. Total 728 students were selected from the 8 (4 schools from rural area and 4 schools from urban area) schools from the Mehsana District of north Gujarat region.

9. Data Analysis and Interpretation

Quantitative data were analyzed by the frequency distribution as the variables of the objectives of the research. Mean, median, t-value, F-value and correlation value calculated for the present research.

Component wise ANOVA on Multidimensional Personality Inventory

Source	Df	Sum of Square	Mean Square	F	Sig. at 0.01
Among	6	311.56	51.926	0.389	NS
Within	722	96372.1	133.479		
Total	728				

H₀₁ *There will be no significant difference between mean score on Multidimensional Personality Inventory of different component of personality of secondary school of Mehsana District.*

The above table indicate that, the F-value of the above comparison of means of component of Multidimensional Personality Inventory is 0.389 (Less than 3.78), which is not significant at 0.01 level of significance. Therefore, it can be inferred that Mean of component of Multidimensional Personality Inventory is not significantly higher on Multidimensional Personality Inventory. So, H_{01} is accepted, which stated as “There will be no significant difference between mean score on Multidimensional Personality Inventory of different component of personality of secondary school of Mehsana District.”

Statistical description of t-value on the Total Sample of Secondary School Students on Multidimensional Personality Inventory

No.	Variable	N	Mean	S.D.	SEd	T	Sig.
2	Total Male Students	347	244.47	33.14	2.46	3.85	0.01
	Total Female Students	381	236.14	33.18			
3	Total Rural Students	486	240.5	35.93	2.69	0.46	NS
	Total Urban Students	242	241.75	33.48			
4	Total Students of Std-8	387	236.92	31.31	2.47	2.73	0.01
	Total Students of Std-9	341	243.68	35.01			

H₀₂ *There will be no significant difference between mean score on Multidimensional Personality Inventory of total male and total female students of secondary school of north Gujarat.*

Result: From the above Table, it is evident that the mean and S.D. of total male students are 244.47 and 33.14 while the mean and S.D. of total female students are 236.14 and 33.18 on total score of Multidimensional Personality Inventory. The obtained t-value is 3.85(3.85>2.58) with 2.46 standard error of mean which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. Thus, mean score of total male students are significantly higher than the mean score of total female students on Multidimensional Personality Inventory. So, H_{02} is rejected. Which is stated as: “There will be no significant difference between mean score on Multidimensional Personality Inventory of total male and total female students of secondary school of Mehsana District.”

H₀₃ *There will be no significant difference between mean score on Multidimensional Personality Inventory of total urban and total rural students of secondary school of north Gujarat.*

Result: From the above Table, it is evident that the mean and S.D. of total urban students are 240.5 and 35.93 while the mean and S.D. of total rural students are 241.75 and 33.48 on total score of Multidimensional Personality Inventory. The obtained t-value is 0.46(0.46< 2.58/1.96) with 2.69 standard error of mean which is not significant at 0.05/0.01 level of significance. Thus, mean score of total rural students are not significantly higher than the mean score of total urban students on Multidimensional Personality Inventory. So, H_{03} is accepted. Which is stated as: “There will be no significant difference between mean score on Multidimensional Personality Inventory of total urban and total rural students of secondary school of Mehsana District.”

H₀₄ *There will be no significant difference between mean score on Multidimensional Personality Inventory of standard eight and standard nine students of secondary school of north Gujarat.*

Result: From the above Table, it is evident that the mean and S.D. of students of standard-8 are 236.92 and 31.31 while the mean and S.D. of students of standard-9 are 243.68 and 35.01 on total score of Multidimensional Personality Inventory. The obtained t-value is 2.73(2.73>2.58)

with 2.73 standard error of mean which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. Thus, mean score of students of standard-9 are significantly higher than the mean score of students of standard-8 on Multidimensional Personality Inventory. So, H_0 is rejected. Which is stated as: "There will be no significant difference between mean score on Multidimensional Personality Inventory of standard eight and standard nine students of secondary school of Mehsana District."

10. Findings

From the above research findings of the study are given as under.

- (1) No significant difference was found between the mean scores component of Multidimensional Personality Inventory.
- (2) Mean score of total male students are significantly higher than the mean score of total female students on Multidimensional Personality Inventory.
- (3) No significant difference was found between the mean scores rural students and urban students on Multidimensional Personality Inventory.
- (4) Mean score of total students of standard -9 are significantly higher than the mean score of total students of standard -8 on Multidimensional Personality Inventory.

11. Conclusion

From the above findings it can be concluded that the total students of standard -9 differed in their perceptions regarding Personality Inventory than the total students of standard -8 and total students of Male differed in their perceptions regarding Personality Inventory than the total female students. No significant difference found between components of Multidimensional Personality Inventory and habitat of students

References

1. Bernstein, Penner, Clarke-Stewart, & Roy (2008). Psychology, 8th edition. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
2. Best, John W. and Khan, James V. (1989). Research in Education. (Sixth Edition). New Delhi : Prentice Hall of India private Limited, P.8.
3. Funder, D. C. (2010). The Personality Puzzle (5th Ed.). NY: Norton
4. George, J. Mouly. (1964). The Science of Educational Research. New Delhi: Euresia Publishing House, P.482.
5. Hornby, A.S. (2000). Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary(Sixth Edition) : Oxford University Press, P.1131.
6. Sindhu, Kulbirsinh. (1984). Methodology of Research in Education. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers. Pvt. Ltd. P.69.
7. Walter, Mischel.(1984). Introduction to Personality, Fourth Edition: Holt Rinrhart and Wriston, inc. International Edition, P.196.
8. Walter, R. Borg and Gall, M.D. (1983). Educational Research: An Introduction. New York: Longman's Green Co. Ltd. P.142.