

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF RURAL AND URBAN SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS IN TERMS OF THEIR PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS

Vineeta Chaudhary

*Assistant Professor, Dayanand Women's Training College, H.N.B. Garhwal Central University, Srinagar Garhwal,
Uttarakhand, India*

Received: 02 Apr 2020

Accepted: 08 Apr 2020

Published: 20 Apr 2020

ABSTRACT

Personality was interpreted as representation of the total psychological structure of the individual. Individual's social stimulus value plays an important role to develop the different personal traits. The present study was undertaken to measure the personality characteristics of the urban and rural boys and girls. The proposed study was conducted on a stratified random sample on 500 High School students. Cattell's 'High-School personality questionnaire' (H.S.P.Q. age of 11 to 12 through 18 years) was used to test the personality traits adopted by Kapoor and Srivastava. The H.S.P.Q measured fourteen (14) distinct dimensions or traits of personality. The scores were standardized and by the application of the t-test, the fourteen personality characteristics were obtained for both the groups (boys and Girls).

KEYWORDS: *Personality, Urban, Rural, Personality, Characteristics and Dimensions*

INTRODUCTION

In today's environment, individual and its individuality occupy an important place for all round development. The personality is related not one field of life or study, but with different fields which show the extent of personality. Traits or characters which differentiated one person to another are responsible for the personality development.

The term personality is often used by Laymen which means –Physical build or a good looking appearance. In a broader context, personality was interpreted as a representation of the total psychological structure of the individual. It was one of the most abstract terms used in our life.

Personality defined by different psychologist in different ways. The important and old classification which was given by Hindu methodology is Bhagavad-Gita's concept. According to which, there are three traits of human personality- (1) Satogun (Irkxq.k), (2) Rajogun (jtkxq.k), (3) Tamogun (reksq.k). On the other hand, Swiss Psychologist interpreted personality as – Extrovert, introvert and ambiverts. Where Extroverts means turning outward with people and take active participation with others. Introvert persons likes to be loneliness and wants to be keeps their feelings much to himself. Ambiverts are those, having tendencies of both extroverts and introverts.

Allport (1937) defined personality as the dynamic organization within the individual of those psychological systems that determines his unique adjustment to his environment. Dashiell (1929) defined personality as an individual's system of reaction and reaction-possibilities into as viewed as fellow members of society. It was some total of behavioral trends manifested as social adjustment. Wood-worth (1947) interpreted personality as the quality of the individual's total behavior. On the other hand Munn (1969) defined personality as the most characteristic integration of an individual's structure and activities.

According to the SOI model- 'Personality traits are categorized under the cognitive, affective and psychomotor domain. There are different personality traits like extroversion, neuroticism, self concept, adjustment and self-discipline, but the development of personality depends on the various factors relating to the social and emotional environment'.

Ruch (1967) investigated that the individual's social stimulus value plays an important role to develop the different personal qualities. According to the Cattell (1950) "Personality was that which permits prediction of what a person will do in a given situation. The goal of psychological research on personality was thus to establish laws about what different people will do in all kind of social and general environmental situations personality is concerned with all the behavior of individual both over and under the skin.

From all the above observations, it was evident that personality was a complex structure of traits in a differentiate manner. The assessment of personality is going more and important for the selection of students to different professions. So, in the present investigation, investigator tried to compare the different personality characteristics of the urban and rural students of 10th grade.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The present study was undertaken to measure the personality characteristics of the urban and rural boys and girls.

Formulated Hypothesis

The Following Hypotheses were advanced to Test the Level of Significance:

- There is no significant difference in mean score obtained on personality scale between High School boys and girls.
- There is no significant difference in mean scores obtained on personality scale between rural boys and urban boys.
- There is no significant difference between rural girls and urban girls in their personality characteristics.

METHODS

The normative survey method was applied to systematize work for the present investigation.

Sample

The present study was conducted through normative survey method on a selected sample of 500 High-School students at different secondary schools of 'Tehri District' of Garhwal Mandal in the state of Uttarakhand. Seven schools were randomly selected which represented the boys and girls including both urban and rural population of art and science group students, respectively. The selected students belonged to the different socio-economic strata of the society.

Tools

In order to find data Cattell's 'High-School personality questionnaire' (H.S.P.Q. age of 11 to 12 through 18 years) was used to test the personality traits. The H.S.P.Q. measured fourteen distinct dimensions or traits of personality. Four forms 'A', 'B', 'C', 'D' were applied for retesting, within a short interval of time. Forms were adapted by Kapoor, Srivastava and Srivastava and published by Psych Centre, New Delhi with arrangement of IPAT, U.S.A. (Third Revised Edition). With the help of given scoring key, all the fourteen personality characteristics were measured.

Statistical Technique

To find out the significance of difference between the subgroups, t-test was applied. The obtained raw score for the fourteen characteristics were converted into standard 'sten scores' before the interpretation.

ANALYSIS OF DATA AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

- The mean score of personality test of the High School students including both boys and girls, were differentiated by the factors B, G, H, I, O and Q4

By the virtue of characteristics B, G, H, I, O and Q4 boys were found to be more intelligent, having super ego strength, venturesome, tough-minded, apprehensive and relaxed as compared to girls who were found to be less intelligent than boys having weaker super ego, shy, timid, secure and tense.

A study of Srivastava (1982) supported the results, who found the boy's superiority over girls.

- The obtained 't' values for the thirteen factors (out of fourteen) were found to be highly significant at 0.01 level of significance in mean achievement score of 'rural and urban boys'.

Urban boys shows higher score in favour of factors A, B, C, E, F, G, H, Q2 and Q3, which revealed that they tended to be good natured, ready to cooperate showing higher scholastic mental capacity, solving emotional problems, demanding their work, more cheerful, talkative, responsible, socially bold, ready to try new things, preferred their own decisions and socially aware and careful. On the other hand, the rural boys were found to be reserved lower in concrete thinking, easily emotional and annoyed, phlegmatic, often dependent taciturn, having weaker super ego-strength. They have usually inferiority feelings, mostly gregarious by choice rather getting the group support. The high score of the factors – 'I' and 'O' showed rural boys as a tender-minded, depended to others and guilt prone whereas the urban boys were found to be more practical, realistic keeping, a group on a practical and non-sense basis.

- The obtained 't' values were found to be significant for the factors A, B, C, E, F, G, H, Q2, Q3, Q4 and 0.01 level of significance, except the factor 'J' between 'rural and urban girls'.

Thus, it is concluded that the urban girls were found to be more outgoing, participant in activities (A), more intelligent and better in abstract thinking (B), Facing reality (C), excitable (D), shows dominating behaviour (E), enthusiastic (F) and more preserving and rule bounds (G), socially bold (H) than the rural girls whereas the rural girl were found to be reserved, less intelligent, easily upset, inactive to their duties, submissive, having super ego strength. On the other hand, four characteristics – I, Q2, Q3 and Q4 shows that the girls of rural areas were found as more depended for the work to others, self sufficient and controlled.

- The 't' values for the factors A, F, G, I, O and Q3 were found to be significant at 0.01 ('O' and Q3) and 0.05 (A, F, G, I) level of significance between the boys and the girls of the rural area.

An examination of mean score of the factors of rural girls and rural boys shows that the girls of the rural area found to be more easygoing, warm hearted and participatory than the rural boys. Factor 'F' shows that the rural girls were found to be sober, serious and taciturn whereas rural boys were found to be happy go – lucky in their habits. Higher score of the factor 'G' in favors of rural girls showed that they were found to be conscientious than the rural boys.

- Mean achievement score of the urban boys and urban girls were found to be significant at 0.01 level of significance for the factors 'B', 'F' and 'O' and significant at 0.05 level of significance for the factors 'G' and 'J', respectively.

On the basis of the above significance level, urban boys were found to be intelligent with higher mental capacity with stronger super ego whereas urban girls were lower in concrete thinking with weaker super ego. Factor 'F', 'J' and 'O' in favors of urban girls revealed that they were found to be enthusiastic, obstructive, guilt prone and with insecure felling whereas urban boys were found to be not overactive, vigorous, enjoy full and self-satisfied.

Educational Implications

From the results of the above findings, it was concluded that the rural and the urban students of the secondary schools were found different in most of the fourteen personality characteristics. The urban boys were found to be superior than the rural boys as well as girls of the urban population were also found to be different in their personality than the rural girls. Boys and girls of the similar population were also differentiated in different personality traits.

To upgrade the different qualities of the student, it is important to activate the child of both the fields and it can be done by the teacher and parents by providing them sufficient activities and support.

REFERENCES

1. *Allport, G.W. A Psychological Interpretation. New York, Henery Holt, p.46 (1937).*
2. *Cattell, R.B. Personality. A Systematic, Theoretical and Factual Study, New York: Mac Grow Hills, (1950).*
3. *Dashiel, J.E. Fundamentals of Objective Psychology, Boston: Houglon, p.55. (1929).*
4. *Manjula, N and Ravi, M.Sambrani. A study of personality of Undergraduates students of the Agriculture College, Asian Journal of Psychology and Education Vol, 30, No. 34 p. 37-40 (1997).*
5. *Munn, N.L.. Introduction to psychology. Bombay: Oxford and IBH Publishing Co. (1969).*
6. *Ruch, F.L. Psychology of life, Foresman and Company, Southern California. (1967).*
7. *Woodworth. Experimental Psychology, Henery Holt. (1947).*