

# Personality with reference to Tribal and Non-tribal college students

Manoj M. Gamit

Ph.D Research Scholar,

Department of Psychology,

Sardar Patel University.

## Abstract:

Aim of the Research is to find out the personality among types of students, gender and types of faculty. So investigator selected three groups one is types of students second is gender and last one is types of faculty. All groups have 240 peoples. Data were collected from Tapi districts. Scale was use for data collection is personal datasheet and personality scale developed by Singh and Singh (2011), 2x2x2 factorial design was used and data were analysis by 'F' test. Result show, type of students was no any significant impact on the personality of tribal and Non-tribal college students. Gender was no any significant impact on the personality of male and female college students. Type of faculty was no any significant impact on the personality of arts and science college students. The interaction between types of students and gender was significant effect on personality (AxB). The interaction between types of students and types of faculty was significant effect on personality (AxC). The interaction between gender and types of faculty was no significant effect on personality (BxC). The interaction between types of students, gender and types of family was no significant effect on personality (AxBxC).

**Key words:** Personality, Types of Students, Gender and Faculty.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Most of us cannot help but wonder how our personality works, how our personality came to be and what it might mean for our future. We also wonder about the personalities of others how they are the same or different from us. Personality psychology concerns what our personalities are, how they work, and what they can mean to our own and others' futures. The discipline of personality psychology helps answer some of these questions. If such questions interest you, you may want to learn more.

If we see around us, we will find that each and every student is born with a unique personality. A great deal is learned through circumstances and other people. Each student has his/her own individual traits and personalities. Some students have different cultural backgrounds, come from different socio economic status, families and have different personalities. There is growing evidence that students who become actively involved in the life of their school and society show very little disaffection and instead experience significant benefits. Although identity development is most often associated with adolescence, each

developmental stage offers opportunity for revaluation and modification. The person that people ultimately become is unique, however the process by which identity develops is similar among individuals.

The construct of personality has been defined by various psychologists in various ways. Allport (1937) collected some more than 50 definitions of personality and also created one of his own. According to Allport- “Personality is dynamic organization within the individual of those psychophysical systems that determine his unique adjustment to his environment”.

Allport (1965) revised definition of personality, this new definition contained word “characteristic” for word “uniqueness” and words “behavior and thought” in place of adjustment. “Personality is a dynamic organization within the individual of those psychophysical systems that determine his characteristic behavior and thought” Allport argues that the psychology of personality can make these contributions (Allport, 1937, pp. 550-566), which I have summarized as follows:

The big five model originated with Allport and Odberts work on trait descriptors which they reduced to 171 variables. Digman (1990), Goldberg (1993), John (1990) by sorting these variables into synonym group reduced variables to 35 bipolar scales through a cluster analysis of trait rating. Cattell further reduced these 35 variables to 12-15 factors using peer rating of these scales. Borgatta (1964), Fiske (1949), Types (1992) found that five robust factors were sufficient to represent the structure of these traits. Norman (1963) also found that five major factors were sufficient to account for large set of personality data. Norman named these factors Surgency, Agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability and culture.

## 2. AIMS OF THE STUDY:

1. To study of the personality among types of students, gender and types of faculty.
2. To study of the effect of interaction on personality among types of students and gender, types of students and faculty, gender and types of faculty.

## 3. HYPOTHESIS:

1. There is no significant difference between the score on personality among tribal and Non-tribal, male and female, arts and science college students.
2. There is no significant interaction effect in score on personality between types of students and gender, types of students and types of faculty, gender and types of faculty.

## 4. Method:

### ➤ Selection of Sample:

Present research work for simple random sampling method used and carried out of 120 tribal and 120 non-tribal respondents. All respondent shall take from Tapi districts college students. Out of which 60 would be male respondents, 60 female respondents and Out of which 30 arts and 30 science college students.

### ➤ Tools used:

The following tools were used in the present study:

**1. Personal Data sheet:**

With the help of this personal data sheet, the information about types of students, gender and types of faculty was collected.

**2. Personality scale:**

This scale developed by Singh and Singh (2011). This scale was translated in Gujarati by Suvera (2015). This scale consist 56 items measures of introversion and extroversion. It is standardized on college population. The test consist all of 56 questions.

**5. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS:**

Analysis of 'F' ANOVA statistic techniques was used.

**6. RESULT AND DISCUSSION:**

Table No. 1

(N = 240)

Means and SDs of Personality with reference to types of students, Gender and types of faculty of college students

Independent Variables→ ↓		Types of Faculty		
		Arts	Science	
Types of Students	Tribal	Male	M =26.73 SD =6.18 N =30	M =24.37 SD =4.64 N =30
		Female	M =23.53 SD =4.67 N =30	M =22.03 SD =5.08 N =30
	Non-Tribal	Male	M =23.33 SD =6.45 N =30	M =25.07 SD =5.82 N =30
		Female	M =22.27 SD =4.00 N =30	M =27.77 SD =8.00 N =30

Table No.2

(N = 240)

2x2x2 ANOVA Analysis summary of Personality with reference to types of students, Gender and Types of faculty of college students

Source of Variance	Sum of square	df	Mean Sum of Square	F	Level of Significant
Types of Students	11.70	1	11.70	0.39	NS
Gender	57.03	1	57.04	1.74	NS
Types of Faculty	42.50	1	42.50	1.29	NS
AxB	192.60	1	192.60	5.86	0.05*
AxC	462.04	1	462.04	14.06	0.01**
BxC	80.50	1	80.50	2.45	NS
AxBxC	31.54	1	31.54	0.96	NS
Error (SSW)	7623.03	232	32.86		
SST	8500.94	239			

\*\* P < 0.01, \*P<0.05.sig. NS = Not Significant.

Table No. 3

(N = 240)

Difference between mean scores of personality with reference to Types of students, Gender and Types of Faculty of college students

Independent Variables	Categories	N	Mean	Difference between the mean
Types of Students	Tribal	120	24.17	0.44
	Non-Tribal	120	24.61	
Gender	Male	120	24.88	0.98
	Female	120	23.90	
Types of Faculty	Arts	120	23.97	0.84
	Science	120	24.81	

❖ **Personality with reference to Types of students :-**

The F value (Table No. 2) is 0.39 and which is statistically no significant. Table No. 3 reveals that the mean scores of life satisfaction of tribal and non-tribal are 24.17 and 24.61 respectively and the difference between

0.44. Hence the null hypothesis No.1 is minted and it is conclude that, there is no significant difference between the personality of tribal and non-tribal college students.

❖ **Personality with reference to gender :-**

The F value (Table No. 2) is 1.74 and which is statistically no significant. Table No. 3 reveals that the mean scores of personality of male and female people are 24.88 and 23.90 respectively and the difference between 0.98. Hence the null hypothesis No.1 is minted it is conclude that, there is no significant difference between the personality of male and female college students.

❖ **Personality with reference to faculty :-**

When check the F value in table No. 2, the F value is 1.29 and it is negligible. It's no significant at 0.05level. Table No. 3 reveals that the mean scores of personality of arts and science are respectively 23.97 and 24.81 and the difference between which is also very negligible. Hence the null hypothesis No.1 is maintained and it is conclude that there is no significant difference between personality of arts and science college students.

**Interactional Effects:**

**Here under were tested the hypothesis no.2 related to interactional effect regarding family planning and birth control attitude: (AXB, AXC, BXC and AXBXC)**

According to table No. 2 the F value 5.86 shows significant interaction effect of types of students and gender on personality. The F value is statistically significant at 0.05 level so the null hypothesis No.2 is rejected and it is conclude that there is significant interaction effect of AxB.

According to table No. 2 the F value 14.06 shows significant interaction effect of types of students and types of faculty on personality. The F value is statistically significant at 0.01 level so the null hypothesis No.2 is rejected and it is conclude that there is significant interaction effect of types of AxC

According to table No. 2 the F value 2.45 shows significant interaction effect of gender and types of faculty on personality. The F value is statistically no significant so the null hypothesis No.2 is minted and it is conclude that there no is significant interaction effect of BxC

According to table No. 2 the F value 0.96 shows significant interaction effect of types of students, gender and types of faculty on personality. The F value is statistically no significant so the null hypothesis No. 2 is minted and it is conclude that there is no significant interaction effect of (AXBxC).

**6. CONCLUSION:**

1. A type of students was no any significant impact on the personality of tribal and Non-tribal college students.
2. Gender was no any significant impact on the personality of male and female college students
3. Type of faculty was no any significant impact on the personality of arts and science college students.
4. There is significant mean interaction effect of the Personality in the types of student and gender of the college students.
5. There is significant mean interaction effect of the Personality in the types of student and types of faculty of the college students.
6. There is no significant mean interaction effect of the Personality in the gender and types of faculty of the college students.

7. The interaction between types of students and gender, types of students and types of faculty, gender and types of students was also no significant effect on personality.

### References:

- Allport, G. W. (1937). *Personality*, New York, Holt. pp. 550-566.
- Allport, G. W. (1965). *Letters from jenny*, New York: Harcourt, Brance and world.
- Digman, J. M. (1990). Personality structure emergence of five factor model. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 41, pp. 417-440.doi: 10.1108/02683940310502368.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1993). The structure of phenotypic personality traits. *American Psychologist*, 48, pp. 26-34.
- John, O. P. (1990). The big five factor taxonomy, dimension of personality in the natural language and in questionnaires: In L.A. Pervin (ed.), *Handbook of personality: Theory of Research*, 66-100, New York, Guilford press.
- Borrgatta, E. F. (1964). The structure of personality characteristics. *Behavioral Science*, 45, pp. 289-292.
- Fiske, D. W. (1949). Consistency of the factorial structure of personality ratings from different sources. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, pp. 329-344.
- Types, E. C. &Christal, R. E. (1992). Recurrent personality factors based on trait ratings. *Journal of personality*, 60, pp. 225-251.
- Norman, W. T. (1963). Towards an adequate tronomy of personality attributes: Replicated factor structure in peer nomination personality ratings. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 66, pp. 574-583.

