

A Comparative Study of Personality of Adolescents among Boys and Girls

DR. KESHAVAMURTHY.T N

Asst Professor in Sociology

GFGC. Bagepalli.

Chickballapur District. Karnataka.

E-mail: tnkmurthy001@gmail.com

Abstract:

This study investigates the personality differences between adolescent boys and girls, with a focus on Superiority and Inferiority complexes. According to Adlerian theory, these complexes are crucial personality structures that indicate personality development. The study employs a quantitative method, utilizing a survey research design and random sampling to select 80 adolescents (40 boys and 40 girls) aged 16-18. The Adolescents Personality Test by Dr. A. Pandey, a standardized tool, is administered to measure personality traits, including Superiority Complex and Inferiority Complex. The findings reveal that adolescent girls exhibit a higher prevalence of Superiority Complex, while adolescent boys display a higher prevalence of Inferiority Complex. These results suggest that gender differences significantly influence personality development among adolescents aged 16-18. The study's outcomes contribute to our understanding of adolescent personality development and have implications for future research and interventions. For human organism life starts from the fertilized womb of the mother. Not only before birth but even the after birth to many years the child is a helpless organism until he is helped by the continuous growth and development and attains maturity. Development of personality takes place at an intensive rate in the adolescent stage. The aim of the study is to compare the personality differences between adolescent boys and girls. The study reveals that there is a significant difference between boys and girls in personality.

Keywords: - Superiority complex, inferiority complex, adolescents, personality, adolescent.

Introduction:

In Adler's theory of individual psychology, a superiority and an inferiority complex are tied together. He held that a person who acted superior to others and held others as less worthy was hiding a feeling of inferiority. Likewise, some people with high aspirations may attempt to hide them by pretending to be modest or incapable. In Adlerian theory, inferiority and superiority complex are personality structures that point to unhealthy development. Adler (1918) defined inferiority feelings as basic feelings of incompleteness, helplessness, and dependency resulting from experiences in early childhood. The feeling of inferiority activates compensatory processes to overcome these negative experiences. The child compensates for the inferior feelings by creating a guiding fantasy, which develops a sense of personal no vulnerability. Inferiority complex is an intense and deep feeling of inadequacy that individuals experience about perceiving others as more competent

than themselves and not feeling ready to overcome a problem. Adler explained that many forms of human behavior, including dreams and various maladjustments, are compensations for feelings of inferiority. During such compensations, the maladjusted individual attempts to free himself from such feelings of inferiority and gain real or imagined power over others. Foundations of personality takes its root by the age of five but at the adolescent stage development of personality is at its peak and since in lives of youngest people the school probably acts as a second only home as the basic influence on the attitude of person will acquire with regard to himself and others. When a child goes to school he/ she enters a world that is removed from the protection that is accorded to him/her from home. The attitude others show towards him/her and his /her interaction towards them help in development of his/ her personality. In this context, consideration on the personality of adolescent of government school and private school is of importance. In everyday usage, "superiority complex" refers to an overly high opinion of oneself. In psychology, it refers not to a belief but a pattern of behaviors expressing the belief that one is superior. According to Hall and Lindsey (1957), a superiority complex is a by-product of striving for perfection.

Research Objectives;

The main objective of this research is to study the Superiority and Inferiority Complex of adolescent boys and girls. This study aimed to examine the comparison between adolescent boys and girls in perspective of their personality difference. The specific objectives include: 1. To examine the Superiority Complex among adolescent's boys and girls. 2. To compare the Superiority Complex between adolescent's boys and girls. 3. To examine the Inferiority Complex among adolescents' boys and girls. 4. To compare the Inferiority Complex between adolescent's boys and girls.

Hypotheses

Based on the above objectives, the following null hypotheses were developed:

- There is no significant difference between Superiority Complex of adolescent's boys and girls.
- There is no significant difference between Inferiority Complex of adolescent's boys and girls.

Methodology In the present study, 80 adolescents in the age range of 16 to 18 years were selected as a sample by random sampling technique. The adolescent Personality Test by Dr. A. Pandey was administered to selected girls and boys (40-40). The scoring of the scale was done accordingly. Statistical analysis was carried out to find the results. The obtained results were analyzed using the Mean and S.D.

Need and Significance of the Study:

Every individual is said to have a personality of his own which is unique and distinct from every other personality. Development of personality mainly depends on physical, chemical, environmental factors which include home, school etc. But the influence of school on child's personality is more powerful, school covers a significant part of child's formative years.

Objectives of the Study

The study was conducted to achieve following objective

1. To compare the personality difference between boys and girls.
2. To compare the personality difference between government school boys and girls.
3. To compare the personality difference between private school boys and girls.

Hypothesis

Keeping in view the objectives of the study, the following hypothesis were formulated for the present study 1.

There is no significant difference between boys and girls in personality.

2. There is no significant difference between boys and girls of government schools in personality.
3. There is no significant difference between boys and girls of private schools in Personality.

Sample

In the present study the student of age group 12 years to age group 18 years will be taken in the sample of adolescent. 600 students were taken with equal ratio of male and female adolescent of Jaipur city.

1. To measure personality – ‘Adolescent personality test’ by Dr. Pandey was used. The APT has 80 statement. These statement are divided into four traits; each trait has 20 statement 10 lead to positive and 10 lead to negative aspects of trait.

Procedure

First of all, the scale was distributed among the adolescent. The subjects were asked to tick mark on the appropriate choice which is suitable for them Statistical analysis

The data obtained through questionnaires were arranged in the form of tables. The mean, S.D, t test and correlation were used for data analysis.

Analysis and Interpretation of Data

Table 1

Group	N	Mean	S.D	t value
Personality of boys	300	88.66	9.33	3.59
Personality of girls	300	85.93	9.31	

df= 598 value at .05 level = 1.96 value at .01=2.58

Table no.1 shows that the obtained value of “t” is 3.59 at df = 598, which is more than the value of “t” at .05 and .01 level of significance. From the given table the mean of personality of boys is 88.66 and personality of girls is 85.93. Hence null hypothesis ‘There is no significant difference between boys and girls in personality’ has been rejected on both the level of significance.

Table 2

Group	N	Mean	S.D	t value
Personality of govt.boys	150	90.06	9.08	1.06
Personality of govt. girls	150	88.95	9.05	

df= 298 value at .05 level = 1.97 value at .01=2.59

Table no.2 shows that the obtained value of “t” is 1.06 at df = 298, which is less than the value of “t” at .05 and .01 level of significance. From the given table the mean of personality of govt. boys is 90.06 and personality of govt. girls is 88.95. Hence null hypothesis ‘There is no significant difference between boys and girls of government schools in personality’ has been accepted on both the level of significance.

Table 3

Group	N	Mean	S.D	t value
Personality of pvt.boys	150	87.27	9.39	4.19
Personality of pvt. girls	150	82.90	8.58	

df= 298 value at .05 level = 1.97 value at .01=2.59

Table no.3 shows that the obtained value of “t” is 4.19 at df = 298, which is more than the value of “t” at .05 and .01 level of significance. From the given table the mean of personality of pvt. Boys is 87.27 and personality of pvt. Girls is 82.90. Hence null hypothesis ‘There is no significant difference between boys and girls of private schools in personality’ has been rejected on both the level of significance.

Conclusion:

This study sought to investigate and contrast the prevalence of superiority complex and inferiority complex among adolescent boys and girls, with a particular focus on examining the relationship between these complexes and personality differences. The research aimed to explore whether significant disparities exist between adolescent boys and girls in terms of their Superiority and Inferiority complex tendencies, and how these complexes intersect with individual personality traits. By examining the complex dynamics between gender, personality, and self-perception, this study aimed to contribute to our understanding of the psychological factors that shape adolescent behavior, Personality and social interactions. The findings of this research can inform strategies for promoting healthy personality development, self-awareness, and emotional well-being

among adolescents, while also highlighting potential gender-specific considerations for interventions and support programs.

References:

1. Kalippan KV. (2008) Personality development of student youth towards nation building: Journal of psychological research University of Madras. Vol.52, No.1, 1-6. References
2. Adler A. Understanding Human Nature. Garden City Publishing Company; c1952.
3. Adeka P. a Study of the Relationship between Inferiority Complex and Superiority Complex. Academia.edu; c2019.
4. Lamberson KA, Wester KL. Feelings of inferiority: A first attempt to define the construct empirically. Journal of Individual Psychology. 2018;74(2):172-87.
5. Sumeyye D, Sahin ES. Inferiority and Superiority Complex: Examination in terms of gender, Birth order and Psychological symptoms. Research Gate. 2023;16(3):375-401.
6. K Chandrasekaran (Namakkal). (2008) A study of environment on personality development Journal of psychological research, Vol.52, No.1, 17-18.
7. Garfield Bester (2007). Personality development of the adolescent. South African journal of education Vol.27 (2) 177-190.
8. Poppy Cullen (2011) An Investigation into Personality Typologies of Adolescent Sexual Offenders. Downey, D. B. (2001). Number of siblings and intellectual development: The resource dilution explanation. American Psychologist, 56, 497-504.
9. Gugl, E., & Welling, L. (2010). The early bird gets the worm? Birth order effects in a dynamic family model. Economic Inquiry, 48, 690-703.
10. Herrera, N.C., Zajonc, R.B., Wiczorkowska, G., & Cichomski, B. (2003). Beliefs about birth rank and their reflection in reality. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85, 142-150.
11. Hjelle, L. A., & Ziegler, D.J. (1992). Personality Theories. Singapore: McGraw Hill.
12. Hotz, V. J., & Pantano, J. (2011). Strategic parenting, birth order and school performance. American Educational Psychology Review, 13, 1-22.
13. Leman, K. (2002). The new birth order book: Why You Are the Way You Are, Michigan: Fleming H. Revell.
14. Liebenau, G. (2005). The collected clinical works of Alfred Adler. The Classical Adlerian Translation Project.
15. McArthur, C. (1956). Personalities of first and second children. Psychiatry: Journal for the Study of Interpersonal Processes, 19, 47-54